

# UNITED WATER IDAHO (PWS 4010016) SOURCE WATER ASSESSMENT REPORT

---

November 12, 2002



## State of Idaho Department of Environmental Quality

**Disclaimer:** This publication has been developed as part of an informational service for the source water assessments of public water systems in Idaho and is based on data available at the time and the professional judgement of the staff. Although reasonable efforts have been made to present accurate information, no guarantees, including expressed or implied warranties of any kind, are made with respect to this publication by the State of Idaho or any of its agencies, employees, or agents, who also assume no legal responsibility for the accuracy of presentations, comments, or other information in this publication. The assessment is subject to modification if new data is produced.

## Executive Summary

Under the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996, all states are required by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to assess every source of public drinking water for its relative sensitivity to contaminants regulated by the Act. This assessment is based on a land use inventory of the designated assessment area and sensitivity factors associated with the wells and aquifer characteristics.

This report, *Source Water Assessment for United Water Idaho*, describes the public drinking water system, the boundaries of the zones of water contribution, and the associated potential contaminant sources located within these boundaries. It includes information regarding all of the wells listed in Table 3. This report does not include information about the following wells: Carriage Hills, Cassia #2, Coventry, Danskin, Foxtail, and Frontier. When information regarding these six wells is obtained, the report will be amended. This report also does not include information concerning the Marden Wastewater Treatment Plant (WTP). The susceptibility of this source has already been assessed in a separate report. This assessment should be used as a planning tool, taken into account with local knowledge and concerns, to develop and implement appropriate protection measures for these sources. **The results should not be used as an absolute measure of risk and they should not be used to undermine public confidence in the water system.**

Final susceptibility scores are derived from System Construction scores, Hydrologic Sensitivity scores, and Potential Contaminant/Land Use scores. Potential Contaminants/Land Uses are divided into four categories, inorganic contaminants (IOCs, i.e. nitrates, arsenic), volatile organic contaminants (VOCs, i.e. petroleum products), synthetic organic contaminants (SOCs, i.e. pesticides), and microbial contaminants (i.e. bacteria). As different wells can be subject to various contamination settings, separate scores are given for each type of contaminant.

The United Water Idaho drinking water system consists of 89 wells; 82 of the wells are included in this report (Table 3). Twenty-four United Water Idaho wells have a high susceptibility to all potential contaminant categories, 33 wells have a moderate susceptibility to all potential contaminant categories, and one well (the Logger well) has a low susceptibility to all potential contaminant categories. Eleven wells have a high susceptibility to IOCs, VOCs, and SOCs, and a moderate susceptibility to microbial contaminants. Eight wells have a moderate susceptibility to IOCs, SOCs, and microbial contaminants, and a high susceptibility to VOCs. The Beacon and Sunset West wells have a high susceptibility to IOCs and a moderate susceptibility to VOCs, SOCs, and microbial contaminants. The Cole well has a high susceptibility to VOCs and SOCs, and a moderate susceptibility to IOCs and microbial contaminants. The Terteling well has a high susceptibility to SOCs and a moderate susceptibility to IOCs, VOCs, and microbial contaminants. The M&M well has a high susceptibility to microbial contaminants and a moderate susceptibility to IOCs, VOCs, and SOCs. See Table 3 for a complete susceptibility summary.

Fourteen wells have an automatic high susceptibility to VOCs due to the detection of perchloroethylene (PERC), trichloroethylene (TCE), toluene, phenols, or carbon tetrachloride. Six of the wells have an automatic high susceptibility to IOCs due to a detection of antimony, thallium, or fluoride at levels above the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs). The Terteling well has an automatic high susceptibility to SOCs due to the detection of atrazine. The M&M well has an automatic high susceptibility to microbial contaminants due to a detection of total coliform at the wellhead and the Swift #3 well has an automatic high susceptibility to all potential contaminant categories due to Harbor Lane that runs within 50 feet of the wellhead (see comments column of Table 3).

Well logs were not available for nine of the 82 wells of United Water Idaho and sanitary surveys were available for only six of the wells. Sanitary surveys are the usual source of information regarding surface flooding protection and wellhead seal requirements. This lack of information increased the hydrologic sensitivity and the system construction scores, contributing to many of the high susceptibility ratings of the United Water Idaho wells. If these sources of information could be provided, the overall scores would likely drop for the wells.

Current water chemistry problems that affect the United Water Idaho water system pertain to the detection of the VOCs PERC, TCE, toluene, phenols, and carbon tetrachloride, the SOC atrazine, and the detection of the IOC fluoride, antimony, arsenic, and thallium at levels above the MCL. Additionally, total coliform bacteria were detected at the M&M well in October 2001. See Appendix C, Table 76 for a summary of all of the detected contaminants in each well.

Between 1992 and 2001, the VOC PERC was detected in twelve wells. PERC is usually associated with dry cleaning businesses. It can cause liver problems and an increased risk of cancer. Also between 1992 and 2001, TCE was detected in three wells. TCE has also been shown to potentially cause liver problems and may increase the overall risk of cancer. Another VOC, carbon tetrachloride was detected in the Amity well in 1999. This contaminant is associated with industrial plants such as chemical plants. As with the other VOCs, it can cause liver problems and an increased risk of cancer. Phenols (VOCs) have been detected in the Bethel well in 1995. Phenols are used as petroleum solvents, disinfectants, and antiseptics. If ingested, phenols can cause gastrointestinal disruption including vomiting, cramps, and diarrhea, renal failure, and liver damage. Toluene was detected in the McMillan well in 1996. Toluene is associated with discharges from petroleum businesses or factories. It can cause kidney, nervous system, and liver problems.

In 1994, the SOC atrazine was detected in the Terteling well. Atrazine is used as a herbicide and may cause cardiovascular system problems and reproductive difficulties.

The IOC antimony was detected in 1993 in four United Water Idaho wells at levels above the MCL of 6 parts per billion (ppb). Antimony is usually associated with petroleum refineries or fire retardants and if ingested can increase blood cholesterol and decrease blood glucose. Fluoride was detected in the Beacon well in 1995 at 4.23 parts per million (ppm), slightly above the MCL of 4 ppm. In extreme cases, fluoride can cause bone disease. Thallium was detected in the Sunset West well in 1994 at 6 ppb. The MCL for Thallium is 2 ppb. Thallium can cause hair loss, liver and kidney problems, and changes in the blood.

Arsenic, an IOC, was also detected in the United Water wells listed below at levels above the newly revised MCL of 10 ppb. In October 2001, the EPA reduced the arsenic MCL from 50 ppb to 10 ppb, giving public water systems (PWSs) until 2006 to comply with the new standard. Twelve of the 82 United Water Idaho wells have had recorded arsenic levels at or above 10 ppb between 1990 and 2001. These wells are: Bali Hai, Bergeson, Centennial, Central Park, Cartwright, Franklin Park, JR Flat, Market, Warm Springs Mesa #3, Swift #1, Vista, and Willow Lane #1. See Appendix C, Table 76 for more information.

In October 2001, total coliform bacteria were detected at the wellhead of the M&M well. In addition, total coliform bacteria have been detected in the distribution system between 1998 and 2001, indicating a possible existing pathway for contamination.

Possibly associated with the total coliform detected in the system, trihalomethanes (disinfection by-products) have been detected in many of the United Water wells. These contaminants are not considered problems with the source water but they are of concern due to their apparent health threat. The trihalomethanes detected include bromodichloromethane, bromoform, chloroform, chlorodibromomethane. These disinfection by-products are formed when chlorine or bromine reacts with natural organic matter (NOM). The formation of by-products is also affected by other factors such as pH, temperature, and dose of disinfectant. Trihalomethanes can cause an increased risk of cancer, liver, kidney, and nervous system problems in long term exposure.

As urban land use is predominant around many of the United Water Idaho wells, 23 delineations cross a priority area of the VOC PERC. However, some of the wells are surrounded by agricultural land with 17 delineations crossing a nitrate priority area and 18 delineations crossing a priority area for the herbicides atrazine and alachlor.

This assessment should be used as a basis for determining appropriate new protection measures or re-evaluating existing protection efforts. No matter what ranking a source receives, protection is always important. Whether the source is currently located in a “pristine” area or an area with numerous industrial and/or agricultural land uses that require surveillance, the way to ensure good water quality in the future is to act now to protect valuable water supply resources.

For United Water Idaho, drinking water protection activities should first focus on documenting the maintenance of the well seal, sanitary seal, and flood protection. This information is usually found on the sanitary survey (an inspection conducted every five years with the purpose of determining the physical condition of a water system’s components and its capacity). These surveys are currently not required for large systems that test for microbial contamination more than five times per month.

As many of the delineations cover predominantly urban areas (see Appendix A), there should be a strong public education program to make people aware that they live above the source of their drinking water. Additionally, storm water practices should be assessed. Since some of the well delineations cross agricultural land uses, there should be a focus on implementation of practices aimed at reducing the leaching of agricultural chemicals from agricultural land within the designated source water areas. No potential contaminants, including roads, houses, or construction sites, should be allowed within 50 feet of any of the wellheads. The use of Harbor Lane that is located within 50 feet of Swift #3 well should be limited to avoid contamination associated with spills or releases.

Since some of the wells overlie PERC plumes, United Water Idaho may need to implement or upgrade engineering controls to reduce the detection of VOCs and SOCs in the water system. Engineering controls may be helpful in reducing the amount of IOCs such as arsenic, thallium, antimony, and fluoride detected in the wells as well.

Should microbial contamination become a problem, appropriate disinfection practices would need to be maintained in a way to protect the drinking water from disinfection by-products, a result of the disinfecting method. Though water cannot be totally free of by-products when disinfection is used, they can be reduced by treatment modifications. See <http://www.epa.gov/safewater/mdbp/dbpl.html> for suggested processing controls.

Much of the designated protection areas are outside the direct jurisdiction of the United Water Idaho, making collaboration and partnerships with the City of Boise, the City of Nampa, state and local agencies and industry groups critical to the success of drinking water protection. All wells should maintain sanitary standards regarding wellhead protection. If the system should need to expand in the future, new well sites should be located in areas with as few potential sources of contamination as possible, and the site should be reserved and protected for this specific use.

Due to the time involved with the movement of ground water, drinking water protection activities should be aimed at long-term management strategies even though these strategies may not yield results in the near term. A strong public education program should be a primary focus of any drinking water protection plan as the delineations contain some urban and residential land uses. Public education topics could include proper lawn and garden care practices, household hazardous waste disposal methods, proper care and maintenance of septic systems, and the importance of water conservation to name but a few. There are multiple resources available to help communities implement protection programs, including the Drinking Water Academy of the EPA. As there are major transportation corridors through the delineations, the Idaho Department of Transportation should be involved in protection activities. Drinking water protection activities for agriculture should be coordinated with the Idaho State Department of Agriculture, the Soil Conservation Commission, the Ada Soil and Water Conservation District, the Canyon Soil Conservation District, and the Natural Resources Conservation Service.

A community must incorporate a variety of strategies in order to develop a comprehensive drinking water assessment protection plan, be they regulatory in nature (i.e. zoning, permitting) or non-regulatory in nature (i.e. good housekeeping, public education, specific best management practices). For assistance in developing drinking water protection strategies please contact the Boise Regional Office of the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ).

# SOURCE WATER ASSESSMENT FOR THE UNITED WATER IDAHO, IDAHO

## Section 1. Introduction - Basis for Assessment

The following sections contain information necessary to understand how and why this assessment was conducted. **It is important to review this information to understand the results of the assessment.** Maps showing the delineated source water assessment areas and the inventory of significant potential sources of contamination identified within the areas are attached (Appendix A and Appendix B). The lists of significant potential contaminant source categories and their rankings used to develop the assessment are also attached (Appendix B).

### Background

Under the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996, all states are required by the EPA to assess every source of public drinking water for its relative susceptibility to contaminants regulated by the Safe Drinking Water Act. This assessment is based on a land use inventory of the delineated assessment area and sensitivity factors associated with the wells and aquifer characteristics.

### Level of Accuracy and Purpose of the Assessment

Since there are over 2,900 public water sources in Idaho, there is limited time and resources to accomplish the assessments. All assessments must be completed by May of 2003. An in-depth, site-specific investigation of each significant potential source of contamination is not possible. **Therefore, this assessment should be used as a planning tool, taken into account with local knowledge and concerns, to develop and implement appropriate protection measures for this source. The results should not be used as an absolute measure of risk and they should not be used to undermine public confidence in the water system.**

The ultimate goal of the assessment is to provide data to local communities to develop a protection strategy for their drinking water supply system. The DEQ recognizes that pollution prevention activities generally require less time and money to implement than treatment of a public water supply system once it has been contaminated. DEQ encourages communities to balance resource protection with economic growth and development. The decision as to the amount and types of information necessary to develop a drinking water protection program should be determined by the local community based on its own needs and limitations. Wellhead or drinking water protection is one facet of a comprehensive growth plan, and it can complement ongoing local planning efforts.

## **Section 2. Conducting the Assessment**

### **General Description of the Source Water Quality**

The public drinking water system for the United Water Idaho is comprised of 89 ground water wells that serve approximately 186,000 people through 64,000 connections. This report includes information concerning 82 of those wells. Eighty-one of the wells are located in Ada County, at various locations around the City of Boise and the M&M well is located in Canyon County near Southside Boulevard (Figure 1).

Current water chemistry problems that affect the United Water Idaho water system pertain to the detection of the VOCs PERC, TCE, toluene, phenols, and carbon tetrachloride, the SOC atrazine, and the detection of the IOCs fluoride, antimony, arsenic, and thallium at levels above the MCL. Additionally, total coliform bacteria were detected at the M&M well in October 2001.


Between 1992 and 2001, the VOC PERC was detected in twelve wells. PERC is usually associated with dry cleaning businesses. It can cause liver problems and an increased risk of cancer. Also between 1992 and 2001, TCE was detected in three wells. TCE can cause liver problems and may increase the risk of cancer. Another VOC carbon tetrachloride was detected in the Amity well in 1999. This contaminant is associated with industrial plants such as chemical plants. As with the other VOCs, it can cause liver problems and an increased risk of cancer. Phenols (VOCs) have been detected in the Bethel well in 1995. Phenols are used as petroleum solvents, disinfectants, and antiseptics. If ingested, phenols can cause gastrointestinal disruption including vomiting, cramps, and diarrhea, renal failure, and liver damage. Toluene was detected in the McMillan well in 1996. Toluene is associated with discharges from petroleum businesses or factories. It can cause kidney, nervous system, and liver problems. In 1994, the SOC atrazine was detected in the Terteling well. Atrazine is used as a herbicide and can cause cardiovascular system problems and reproductive difficulties. See Table 3 for more information. Appendix C, Table 76 provides a summary of detected contaminants in each well.

The IOC antimony was detected in 1993 in the Amity, Arctic, Kirkwood, and Roosevelt #1 wells at levels above the MCL of 6 parts per billion (ppb). Antimony is usually associated with petroleum refineries or fire retardants and if ingested can increase blood cholesterol and decrease blood glucose. Fluoride was detected in the Beacon well in 1995 at 4.23 parts per million (ppm), slightly above the MCL of 4 ppm. In extreme cases, fluoride can cause bone disease. Thallium was detected in the Sunset West well in 1994 at 6 ppb. The MCL for Thallium is 2 ppb. Thallium can cause hair loss, liver and kidney problems, and changes in the blood. See Table 3 or Appendix C, Table 76 for a summary of detected contaminants in each well.

Arsenic, an IOC, was also detected in the United Water wells listed below at levels above the newly revised MCL of 10 ppb. In October 2001, the EPA reduced the arsenic MCL from 50 ppb to 10 ppb, giving public water systems (PWSs) until 2006 to comply with the new standard. Twelve of the 82 wells have had recorded arsenic levels at or above 10 ppb between 1990 and 2001. These wells are: Bali Hai, Bergeson, Centennial, Central Park, Cartwright, Franklin Park, JR Flat, Market, Warm Springs Mesa #3, Swift #1, Vista, and Willow Lane #1. See Appendix C, Table 76 for more information.

In October 2001, total coliform bacteria were detected at the wellhead of the M&M well. In addition, coliform bacteria have been detected in the distribution system between 1998 to 2001, indicating a possible existing pathway for contamination.







Possibly associated with the total coliform detected in the system, trihalomethanes (disinfection by-products) have been detected in the United Water wells. These contaminants are not considered problems with the source water but they are of concern due to their apparent health threat. These trihalomethanes are bromodichloromethane, bromoform, chloroform, chlorodibromomethane. Though water cannot be totally free of by-products when disinfection is used, they can be reduced by treatment modifications. These disinfection by-products are formed when chlorine or bromine reacts with natural organic matter (NOM). The formation of by-products is also affected by other factors such as pH, temperature, and dose of disinfectant. Trihalomethanes can cause an increased risk of cancer, liver, kidney, and nervous system problems in long term exposure.

As urban land use is predominant around many of the United Water Idaho wells, 23 delineations cross a priority area of the VOC PERC. However, some of the wells are surrounded by agricultural land with 17 delineations crossing a nitrate priority area and 18 delineations crossing a priority area for the pesticides atrazine and alachlor.

### **Defining the Zones of Contribution – Delineation**

The delineation process establishes the physical area around a well that will become the focal point of the assessment. The process includes mapping the boundaries of the zone of contribution into time-of-travel (TOT) zones (zones indicating the number of years necessary for a particle of water to reach a well) for water in the aquifer. DEQ contracted with BARR Engineering to perform the delineations using a combination of MODFLOW and a refined analytical element computer model approved by the EPA in determining the 3-year (Zone 1B), 6-year (Zone 2), and 10-year (Zone 3) TOT for water associated with the Boise Valley aquifer and the Mountain Home Plateau aquifer in the vicinity of the wells of United Water Idaho. United Water wells associated with the Boise Valley aquifer include all wells except for the Raptor, JR Flat, Ten Mile, Pleasant Valley, Market, Pioneer, Terteling, Byrd, and BIF wells. These nine wells are associated with the Mountain Home Plateau aquifer. The computer models used site specific data, assimilated by BARR Engineering from a variety of sources including the United Water Idaho well logs, other local area well logs, the Treasure Valley Hydrologic Project, and hydrogeologic reports (detailed below).

### **Boise Valley Aquifer: Treasure Valley Hydrologic Project Information (Petrich and Urban, 1996; Neely and Crockett, 1998; Petrich et al., 1999)**

The “Treasure Valley” is a geopolitical region that includes the lower Boise River sub-basin. The lower Boise River sub-basin begins where the Boise River exits the mountains near the Lucky Peak Reservoir. From Lucky Peak Dam the lower Boise River flows about 64 (river) miles northwestward through the Treasure Valley to its confluence with the Snake River. The Treasure Valley Hydrologic Project area encompasses the lower Boise River area, and extends south to the Snake River. The southern area is included in the study area because of ground water flow from the Lower Boise River basin south toward the Snake River.

Significant amounts of desert area were converted to flood irrigated agriculture beginning in the 1860s. Irrigation led to increases in shallow ground water levels in some areas. The shallow ground water levels provided an inexpensive and readily obtainable water supply that is used extensively throughout the valley. Much of the population growth in the Treasure Valley has been occurring in previously flood-irrigated agricultural areas, resulting in increased pumpage and a reduction in local aquifer recharge. In addition, irrigation in some areas has become more efficient, reducing the amount of irrigation-related infiltration. Decreasing aquifer recharge and increasing pumpage is thought to be contributing to decreasing ground water levels in some areas.

The Treasure Valley experiences a temperate and arid-to-semiarid climate. Average high temperatures range from about 90°F in summer to 36°F in winter; low temperatures range from about 20°F in winter to about 56°F in summer. The average precipitation ranges from about 8 to 14 inches throughout most of the valley, most of which falls during the colder months.

Major surface water bodies include the Boise River, Lake Lowell, and Lucky Peak Reservoir. The primary source of surface water in the Treasure Valley is precipitation falling in the high elevation area in the Boise River basin upstream of Lucky Peak Dam. Much of the runoff from high elevation areas is stored in three reservoirs: Anderson Ranch Reservoir, Arrowrock Reservoir, and Lucky Peak Reservoir.

The region's croplands are irrigated primarily with surface water through an extensive network of reservoirs and canals. The first canals were constructed in the 1860's; there are now over 1,100 miles of major and intermediate canals in the Treasure Valley. The primary sources of the irrigation water in the Treasure Valley include the Boise, Snake, and Payette Rivers. The majority of canals are owned and maintained by canal companies and irrigation districts.

### **Boise Valley Aquifer Hydrogeology (from Petrich et al., 1999)**

The lower Boise River sub-basin (Treasure Valley) is located within the northwest-trending topographic depression known as the western Snake River Plain. The western Snake River Plain is a relatively flat lowland separating Cretaceous granitic mountains of west-central Idaho from the granitic/volcanic Owyhee mountains in southwestern Idaho. The western Snake River Plain extends from about Twin Falls, Idaho northwestward to Vale, Oregon. The Snake River Plain is about 30 miles wide in the section containing the lower Boise River.

Sediments originating from the surrounding mountains began accumulating on top of thick, basal basalts. Rifting and continued subsidence maintained the lowland topography, leading to the additional accumulation of water and sediments (Othberg, 1994). Basin infilling by sediments and basalt occurred from the late Miocene through the late Pliocene (Othberg, 1994). Incision caused by flowing water in major drainages (e.g., Snake and Boise Rivers) began in the late Pliocene or early Pleistocene, although deposition of coarse sediments continued during Quaternary glaciations (Othberg, 1994).

Several Quaternary basalt flows have been described in the western Snake River Plain, and have been assigned to the upper Snake River Group (Malde, 1991; Malde and Powers, 1962). Lava flowed across portions of the ancestral Snake River Valley (Malde, 1991) in an area that is now south of the Boise River. The Snake River then changed course, incising at its present location along the southern margin of the basalt flows. More recent eruptions (from Kuna Butte and other local sources) spilled lava into the canyon south of Melba. The Snake River has since incised this basalt (Malde, 1991).

The general stratigraphy of the western Snake River Plain consists of (from top to bottom) a thick layer of sedimentary deposits underlain by a thick series of basalt flows, which in turn are underlain by older, tuffaceous sediments and basalt (Malde, 1991; Clemens, 1993). The upper thick zone of sediments (up to approximately 6,000 feet thick) distinguishes the western Snake River Plain from the eastern Snake River Plain, in which the upper section is primarily Quaternary basalt (Wood and Anderson, 1981).

The uppermost sediments and basalt belong to the Pleistocene-age Snake River Group. The Snake River Group consists of terrace sediments, Quaternary alluvium, and Pleistocene basalt flows (Wood and Anderson, 1981). Snake River Group sediments and basalts cover much of the project area (Othberg and Stanford, 1992).

The Snake River Group overlies the Idaho Group sediments. The Idaho Group sediments can be divided into two general parts (Wood and Anderson, 1981). The lower Idaho Group contains sediments described as lake and stream deposits of buff white, brown, and gray sand, silt, clay, diatomite, numerous thin beds of vitric ash, and some basaltic tuffs. The upper part of the lower Idaho Group also contains some local, thin, basalt flows. The upper Idaho Group consists of sands, claystones, and siltstones, but differs from the lower Idaho Group in that it contains a greater percentage of coarser-grained materials. The upper Idaho Group is associated with a fluvial/deltaic/lacustrine depositional environment; the lower Idaho Group sediments were deposited in more of a lacustrine/deltaic environment (Wood, 1994).

Wood (1994) identified a buried lacustrine delta within the Idaho Group sediments in the Nampa-Meridian area. The location of the delta in the middle of the western Snake River Plain suggests that the eastern part of the Boise River basin was delta plain and flood plain at the time of deposition, while the western part was a deep lake environment. The delta probably prograded northwestward into a lake basin 800 feet deep, based upon high resolution seismic reflection data and resistivity log interpretations. The delta-plain and front sediments were shown to be mostly fine-grained, well-sorted sand with thin layers of mud (Wood, 1994). The northwest trend of the delta indicates a sediment source to the southeast, such as where the Snake River flows today (Wood, 1994).

A substantial, laterally extensive layer of clay is found at depths of 300 to 700 feet below ground surface. The clay is important because it represents, in some areas, a significant aquitard separating shallow overlying aquifers from deeper zones. The clay, often described in well logs as having a blue or gray color, has been observed as far west as Parma, and as far east as Boise (although the clay is not found in the extreme eastern portions of the Treasure Valley). The clay varies from a few feet to a few hundred feet in thickness. Although significant layers of clay are present throughout the Idaho Group sediments, individual clay units are not necessarily continuous over large areas. Also, the top of the clay can vary in elevation by up to approximately 200 feet in some locations, such as in an area west of Lake Lowell. In general, sediments above the “blue clay” are coarser-grained than the interbedded sands, silts, and clays underlying the “blue clay.”

The top of the upper Idaho Group is marked in several parts of the Treasure Valley by a widespread fluvial gravel deposit known as the Tenmile gravels. Tenmile gravels contain rounded granitic rocks and felsic porphyries originating from the Idaho Batholith to the north and northeast. The Tenmile gravels range up to 500 feet in thickness along the Tenmile Ridge south of Boise, but are less than 50 feet thick in the Meridian-Meridian area (Wood and Anderson, 1981).

### **Boise Valley Aquifer Systems and Hydrogeologic Characteristics**

Ground water for municipal, industrial, rural domestic, and irrigation uses in the Treasure Valley is drawn almost entirely from Snake River Group and Idaho Group aquifers. Many domestic wells draw water from shallow aquifers, such as those in the Snake River Group deposits. Larger production wells (for municipal and agricultural uses) draw water from the deeper Idaho Group sediments.

Aquifers contained in the Snake River and Idaho Group sediments comprise shallow and regional ground water flow systems. Shallow aquifers contained in Snake River Group sediments and basalts may belong to local flow systems. Most local flow system recharge stems from irrigation infiltration and channel (e.g., streams or canals) losses. Discharge from shallow, local flow systems often is to local drains or streams. The time from recharge to discharge in shallow flow systems (residence times) probably ranges from days to tens of years.

In contrast, regional ground water flow systems extend much deeper than local flow systems. The Treasure Valley regional flow system begins in the eastern part of the valley, as indicated by downward hydraulic gradients in the Boise Fan sediments described by Squires et al. (1992). Some water also enters the regional flow system as underflow from the Boise Foothills in the northeastern part of the valley. The regional flow system is thought to discharge primarily to the Boise and Snake Rivers in the western and southwestern parts of the valley.

Aquifer material characteristics, material heterogeneity, and structural controls influence Treasure Valley ground water flow. Coarse-grained materials (e.g., sand and gravel) in upper zones are more capable of transmitting ground water than fine-grained sediments (e.g., silt and clay). Clay and silt in the Snake River sediments can restrict vertical and/or horizontal ground water movement. Perched aquifers are created when fine-grained lenses impede downward vertical flow. A distinctive clay layer, sometimes referred to as "blue clay," is present over large portions of the valley. The clay is absent in the easternmost portions of the lower Boise River Basin, but can reach a thickness of more than 200 feet toward the central and western portions of the basin.

Sequences of interbedded sand, silt, and clay, such as the Deer Flat Surface and the upper portion of the Glens Ferry Formation of the upper Idaho Group in the Meridian-Meridian area, are the major water-producing aquifers in a large part of Canyon County (Anderson and Wood, 1981). The coarse-grained sediments in this zone produce water in excess of 2,000 gallons per minute (gpm).

### **Mountain Home Plateau Aquifer Hydrogeology**

The Mountain Home Plateau is a broad, flat plateau, which slopes gently towards the southwest. The plateau is broken by volcanic structures – crater rings, cinder cones, and shield volcanoes. The plateau generally is above 3,000 feet in altitude, except in the extreme western part. All streams draining the plateau are ephemeral, flowing south toward the Snake River. The larger streams draining the Danskin Mountains to the north are fed by springs in the Tertiary volcanics and Cretaceous granites. Characterized by hot, dry summers and cold winters, the climate of the plateau is semi-arid. Average annual precipitation ranges from nine inches on the plateau to about 23 inches in the mountains (Norton et al., 1982).

The major geologic units in the Mountain Home Plateau are: 1) alluvium and younger terrace gravels, 2) Snake River Group, 3) Idaho Group, 4) Idavada Volcanics, and 5) Idaho Batholith. The basalts are considerably thicker in the northern section of the study area. Two of the formations of the Idaho Group, the Glens Ferry Formation and the Bruneau, are the main aquifer systems (Ralston and Chapman, 1968). The basalts of the Bruneau Formation thin rapidly to the east and to the south. Two parallel northwest trending faults cut through the area. An apparent third fault, trending east from Cinder Cone Butte, bisects one of the northwest faults near Cleft. Several volcanic structures are present on the plateau including Crater Rings, Cinder Cone Butte, and Lockman Butte (Norton et al., 1982). There are two main aquifers in the Mountain Home area: 1) a shallow, perched system beneath Mountain Home and 2) a deeper, regional system.

The perched system underlies approximately 38,000 acres extending from about 10 miles south to 4 miles north of the City of Mountain Home with a 4 mile width in the area of the City (Young, 1977). For the most part, ground water in the perched system is in the clay, silty, sand, and gravel layers of the Quaternary Alluvium. Depth to water in the shallow system can be less than 10 feet but varies considerably along the limits of the perched system as the water moves vertically down the regional system (Norton et al., 1982). Recharge to the perched system occurs from Rattlesnake and Canyon Creeks as well as seepage from Mountain Home Reservoir and the canals and laterals that distribute the water. Natural discharge from the perched system occurs mainly as downward percolation to the regional system and as spring flow at Rattlesnake Spring near the Snake River Canyon rim. The direction of flow in the perched ground water system is towards the southwest.

The deeper, regional aquifer supplies ground water to the large irrigation wells and municipal wells for Mountain Home and the Air Force base. The major rock types are basalts of the Bruneau Formation, Idaho Group, and poorly consolidated detrital material and minor basalt flows of the Glenns Ferry Formation, Idaho Group. Well yields from the basalts of the Bruneau Formation range from 10 to 3500 gallons per minute (gpm). The range of the well yields for the Glenns Ferry Formation is three to 350 gpm. The Bruneau Formation thins rapidly towards the east where the Glenns Ferry Formation becomes the major source of ground water (Norton et al., 1982).

The Glenns Ferry Formation, a thick intertonguing deposit of lake and stream sediments, is the primary aquifer in the eastern portion of the area. Due to the fine-grained nature of the sediments, the permeability and yield to wells is generally low. The formation is composed of tan, gray, and white clay, silt, and fine to medium sand (Ralston and Chapman, 1968). The formation has been noted as being 2000 feet thick near Glenns Ferry (Malde and Powers, 1962).

The sediments and basalt of the Bruneau Formation are the primary aquifers in the Mountain Home area. The jointing, fracturing, and vesicular character of the basalts causes them to be very permeable. The majority of ground water withdrawal from the formation is from deeper interflow zones and a thin but extensive series of sand beds just below the lower basalt unit. The unit has approximately 1500 feet of lake and stream sediments with numerous basalt interbeds. The basalts tend to be dark gray to black when fresh but weather to a reddish gray-brown color. Most of the interflow zones contain large quantities of glassy cinders and some ash (Ralston and Chapman, 1968).

Ralston and Chapman (1968 and 1970) found that recharge to the ground water system in the eastern portion of the Mountain Home Plateau is limited due to low amounts of precipitation, relatively impermeable material in the area of most precipitation, and high evapotranspiration rates. Recharge to the regional system occurs as downward percolation of precipitation that falls on the mountains, losses from intermittent stream flows, and from downward percolation from the perched system. Discharge from the regional system occurs as spring flow, underflow to the Snake River, and pumpage.

In general, the direction of ground water flow is towards the southwest with a southern component in the southeast and a western component in the northwest. Low permeability along the apparent east-west trending fault through Cleft limits the flow to the north. The ground water elevation is 70 to 165 feet higher on the south side of the fault (Norton et al., 1982).

The delineated source water assessment areas for the majority of the wells of the United Water Idaho can best be described as southeastward trending corridors approximately 4 to 4.5 miles long and one mile wide. Some of the delineations of the wells extend directly eastward for approximately 2 to 4 miles long and one mile wide. Other delineations spread northeastward for approximately 3 to 4 miles long and one mile wide (Figures 2 through 75, Appendix A). The delineated source water assessment areas for the Cartwright, Central Park, M&M, and Spurwing wells are circular areas extending radially approximately 550 feet in each direction from the wellhead. Barr Engineering was unable to obtain enough well pumping data to create an accurate delineation for these wells (Figures 14, 18, 54, and 70). Therefore, the delineations for these wells do not include a 6-year or a 10-year TOT zone. The actual data used by BARR Engineering in determining the source water assessment delineated areas for all of the wells are available from DEQ upon request.



## **Identifying Potential Sources of Contamination**

A potential source of contamination is defined as any facility or activity that stores, uses, or produces, as a product or by-product, the contaminants regulated under the Safe Drinking Water Act and has a sufficient likelihood of releasing such contaminants at levels that could pose a concern relative to drinking water sources. The goal of the inventory process is to locate and describe those facilities, land uses, and environmental conditions that are potential sources of ground water contamination. The locations of potential sources of contamination within the delineation areas were obtained by field surveys conducted by DEQ, the local operator, and from available databases.

Land use within the immediate area of the majority of the United Water Idaho wellheads consists of mostly residential, commercial, and transportation corridor uses, while the surrounding area is predominantly land under residential and commercial development or urban. For some of the wellheads, land use in the immediate area consists of irrigated agriculture while the surrounding areas are predominantly urban land use. The Redwood Creek wellhead is surrounded predominantly by irrigated agricultural land and the land use for the Pioneer, Pleasant Valley, Raptor, and Ten Mile wells consists predominantly of rangeland. The M&M well is the only United Water Idaho well that is located in Nampa with commercial and residential land use in the immediate area of the wellhead.

It is important to understand that a release may never occur from a potential source of contamination provided they are using best management practices. Many potential sources of contamination are regulated at the federal level, state level, or both to reduce the risk of release. Therefore, when a business, facility, or property is identified as a potential contaminant source, this should not be interpreted to mean that this business, facility, or property is in violation of any local, state, or federal environmental law or regulation. What it does mean is that the potential for contamination exists due to the nature of the business, industry, or operation. There are a number of methods that water systems can use to work cooperatively with potential sources of contamination, including educational visits and inspections of stored materials. Many owners of such facilities may not even be aware that they are located near a public water supply well.

## **Contaminant Source Inventory Process**

A two-phased contaminant inventory of the study area was conducted in January and February 2002. The first phase involved identifying and documenting potential contaminant sources within the United Water Idaho source water assessment areas (Appendix A, Figures 2 through 75) through the use of computer databases and Geographic Information System (GIS) maps developed by DEQ. The second, or enhanced, phase of the contaminant inventory was completed by DEQ staff to identify and add any additional potential sources in the area.

The delineated source water areas contain a varying number of potential contaminant sites, ranging from zero (the Pioneer well) to 784 (the Swift 1 and 2 wells). The delineations contain transportation corridors (Union Pacific Railroad, Interstate 84) and various commercial, industrial, and agricultural sources as potential sources of contamination. Spills occurring on the transportation corridors could contribute all classes of contamination to the aquifer. Many of the delineations also contain surface waters such as the New York Canal, the Ridenbaugh Canal, and the Boise River. Additionally, there are sites regulated by the Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA), the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA), and the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA). Appendix B contains the locations of these potential contaminant sources as well as a description for each well (Tables 4 through 75).

### Section 3. Susceptibility Analyses

Each well's susceptibility to contamination was ranked as high, moderate, or low risk according to the following considerations: hydrologic characteristics, physical integrity of the well, land use characteristics, and potentially significant contaminant sources. The susceptibility rankings are specific to a particular potential contaminant or category of contaminants. Therefore, a high susceptibility rating relative to one potential contaminant does not mean that the well is at the same risk for all other potential contaminants. The relative ranking that is derived for each well is a qualitative, screening-level step that, in many cases, uses generalized assumptions and best professional judgement. Appendix D contains the susceptibility analysis worksheets. The following summaries describe the rationale for the susceptibility ranking.

#### Hydrologic Sensitivity

The hydrologic sensitivity of a well is dependent upon four factors: the surface soil composition, the material in the vadose zone (between the land surface and the water table), the depth to first ground water, and the presence of fine-grained geologic material above the producing zone of the well. Slowly draining soils such as silt and clay typically are more protective of ground water than coarse-grained soils such as sand and gravel. Similarly, fine-grained sediments in the subsurface and a water depth of more than 300 feet protect the ground water from contamination.

Hydrologic sensitivity is high for seventeen of the wells, moderate for 64 of the wells, and low for Logger well (Table 3). Well logs for nine of the wells were unavailable, preventing a determination of the hydrologic composition surrounding the wells and thereby increasing the hydrologic sensitivity score. For four of the wells, the well logs provided did not disclose enough information related to the composition of the soil layers and the placing of the annular seals, contributing to some of the high sensitivity ratings. Thick, low permeable clay layers above the producing zones, indicated by the available well logs, contributed to the moderate and low sensitivity ratings for many of the wells. Regional soil data varies for the area. Poor to moderately draining soils are found along the Boise River. The vadose zone near the wellheads consists of sand and gravel, clay, and lava in various proportions. Information regarding the hydrologic sensitivity of each well is summarized in Table 1 below.

**Table 1. Hydrologic Sensitivity Criteria Results for United Water Idaho Wells**

Well Name	Vadose Zone Composition	Aquitard Present? (feet bgs)	1 <sup>st</sup> Ground water (feet bgs)	Surface Soil Composition
16 <sup>th</sup> Street	unknown	140	NI	Moderate to Well
27 <sup>th</sup> Street	sand/boulders	139	NI	Poor to Moderate
Amity	Lava	129	282-303	Moderate to Well
Arctic	NI	NI	NI	Moderate to Well
Bali Hai	unknown	636	7-9	Moderate to Well
Beacon	sandy/gravel	304	4-44	Poor to Moderate
Bergeson	clay	353	60-145	Moderate to Well
Bethel	sand/gravel	No-38	35-98	Moderate to Well
BIF	sand/gravel	84	160-170	Moderate to Well
Broadway	sand/gravel	66	NI	Poor to Moderate
Brookhollow	river rock/sand	196	4-5	Moderate to Well
Byrd	NI	NI	NI	Moderate to Well
Cartwright	shale/clay	90	495-505	Moderate to Well
Cassia #1	sand/gravel	314	217-233	Poor to Moderate
Centennial	sand/gravel	56	NI	Moderate to Well
Central Park	NI	NI	NI	Moderate to Well
Chamberlain #1	sand/gravel	No	NI	Poor to Moderate

Well Name	Vadose Zone Composition	Aquitard Present? (feet bgs)	1 <sup>st</sup> Ground water (feet bgs)	Surface Soil Composition
Chamberlain #2	NI	NI	NI	Poor to Moderate
Cliffside	NI	NI	NI	Moderate to Well
Clinton	gravel	250	4-42	Moderate to Well
Cole	gravel	120	31-155	Moderate to Well
Country Club	sand	158	168-201	Moderate to Well
Countryman	sand/gravel	163	NI	Moderate to Well
Country Square	NI	NI	NI	Moderate to Well
Durham	clay	No-31	78-81	Moderate to Well
Edgeview	unknown	400	NI	Moderate to Well
Fisk	sand/gravel	543	4-45	Moderate to Well
Five Mile #12	NI	NI	NI	Moderate to Well
Floating Feather	sand/gravel	105	NI	Poor to Moderate
Franklin Park	clay	277	415-430	Moderate to Well
Goddard	sand/gravel	235	40-83	Moderate to Well
Hidden Valley #1	sand/gravel	No-19	112-118	Moderate to Well
Hidden Valley #2	unknown	80	NI	Moderate to Well
Hillcrest	sand/gravel	696	NI	Moderate to Well
Hilton	sand/gravel	138	28-78	Moderate to Well
Hope	silty clay	156	NI	Moderate to Well
HP	sand/gravel	544	610-700	Moderate to Well
Hummel	gravel	154	295	Moderate to Well
Idaho	sand/gravel	282	illegible	Poor to Moderate
Island Woods #1	sand/gravel	74	1-31	Poor to Moderate
Island Woods #2	sand/gravel	75	0-27	Moderate to Well
JR Flat	clay/sand	286	443-468	Moderate to Well
Kirkwood	gravel	218	NI	Moderate to Well
La Grange	NI	NI	NI	Moderate to Well
Licorice	Unknown	>51	87-102	Poor to Moderate
Logger	sand/gravel	133	340-358	Poor to Moderate
Longmeadow	sand/gravel	108	0-65	Poor to Moderate
M&M	sand/gravel	59	18-26	Moderate to Well
Mac	sand/gravel	236	60-70	Moderate to Well
Maple Hills	sand/gravel	335	275-320	Moderate to Well
Market	clay	658	NI	Moderate to Well
McMillan	NI	NI	NI	Moderate to Well
Overland	sand/gravel/clay	297	165-170	Moderate to Well
Paradise	clay with sand	302	27-41	Moderate to Well
Pioneer	gravel/clay	82	405-549	Moderate to Well
Pleasant Valley	sand/gravel/clay	>50	NI	Moderate to Well
Raptor	sand/gravel	170	640-665	Moderate to Well
Redwood Creek	sand/top soil	236	NI	Poor to Moderate
River Run	sand/gravel	201	0-50	Poor to Moderate
Roosevelt #1	NI	NI	NI	Moderate to Well
Roosevelt #3	sand/gravel	258	465-540	Moderate to Well
Settlers	NI	NI	NI	Moderate to Well
Sherman Oaks	NI	NI	NI	Moderate to Well
Spurwing	gravel/clay	141	NI	Poor to Moderate
Sunset West	sand/gravel	72	122-132	Moderate to Well
Swift #1	sand/gravel	No-41	8-13	Poor to Moderate

Well Name	Vadose Zone Composition	Aquitard Present? (feet bgs)	1 <sup>st</sup> Ground water (feet bgs)	Surface Soil Composition
Swift #2	sand/gravel	No-47	0-42	Poor to Moderate
Swift #3	sand/gravel	455	6-45	Poor to Moderate
Taggart #1	sand/gravel	190	42-80	Moderate to Well
Taggart #2	sand/gravel	323	535-555	Moderate to Well
Ten Mile	sand/gravel	269	520-590	Moderate to Well
Terteling	sand/gravel	183	NI	Moderate to Well
Veterans	sand/gravel	150	1-41	Poor to Moderate
Victory	sand/gravel	194	NI	Moderate to Well
Vista	clay/sand/gravel	147	45-72	Moderate to Well
Warm Springs Mesa #1	NI	NI	NI	Poor to Moderate
Warm Springs Mesa #2	NI	NI	NI	Poor to Moderate
Warm Springs Mesa #3	NI	NI	NI	Poor to Moderate
Westmoreland	unknown	>50	NI	Moderate to Well
Willow #1	sand/gravel	No	NI	Poor to Moderate
Willow #2	NI	NI	NI	Poor to Moderate
Willow #3	sand/gravel	No-9	NI	Poor to Moderate

NI = No Information, BGS = below ground surface

## Well Construction

Well construction directly affects the ability of the well to protect the aquifer from contaminants. System construction scores are reduced when information shows that potential contaminants will have a more difficult time reaching the intake of the well. Lower scores imply a system is less vulnerable to contamination. For example, if the well casing and annular seal both extend into a low permeability unit, then the possibility of contamination is reduced and the system construction score goes down. If the highest production interval is more than 100 feet below the water table, then the system is considered to have better buffering capacity. If the wellhead and surface seal are maintained to standards, then contamination down the well bore is less likely. As there are no sanitary surveys, the issue of well seals could not be addressed. If a well is protected from surface flooding and is outside the 100-year floodplain, then contamination from surface events is reduced.

Well drillers' reports were available for 73 of the 82 wells, providing useful system construction information. Sanitary surveys were not available for most of the wells, preventing a determination of the maintenance of wellhead and surface seals and protection of the wells from surface flooding. Forty-seven wells rate high, thirty-four wells rate moderate, and the Goddard #2 well rates low for system construction. The majority of the moderate and low ratings are mainly due to the indication that the casing and annular seal extended to low permeability units. Information regarding the wells is summarized below (Table 2).

**Table 2. United Water of Idaho Well Construction Summary Information**

<b>Well</b>	<b>Well Depth (ft)</b>	<b>Water Table Depth (ft)</b>	<b>Casing: diameter/ thickness (in)</b>	<b>Casing: depth (ft)/ formation</b>	<b>Surface seal: depth (ft)/ formation</b>	<b>Screened Interval (ft)</b>	<b>Drill Year</b>	<b>Sanitary Survey Elements (A/B) <sup>1</sup></b>
<b>16<sup>th</sup> Street</b>	532	NI	24/NI 20/NI 12/NI	35/yellow sand 49/grey brown sand 532/hard gray sand	NI	NI	1951	NI/NI
<b>27<sup>th</sup> Street</b>	580	43	18/0.315 10/0.365	478/gray clay, fine to med. sand 563/gray clay	480/gray clay, fine to med sand	501-521 521-532 532-553	1997	NI/NI
<b>Amity</b>	670	119	16/0.375 10/0.375	11/broken lava 620/fine blue & black sand	76/streaks of cemented sand and gravel, brown clay	illegible	1979	NI/NI
<b>Arctic</b>	346	NI	32/NI 27/NI 16/NI 12/NI	11/NI 124/NI 222/NI 310/NI	NI	315-327	1969	NI/NI
<b>Bali Hai</b>	850	NI	16/0.375 12/0.375	347/blue clay 359/blue clay 493/blue clay 504/blue gray clay 568/clay 587/sand 602/clay	120/tan clay with iron stain	347-356 359-373	1972	NI/NI
<b>Beacon</b>	505	8	20/0.250 18/0.375 12/0.250	23/sand & gravel 221/blue clay sticky 205/sand, clay & cemented sand	221/blue clay sticky	226-488	1987	NI/NI
<b>Bergeson</b>	663	121	20/0.250 18/0.375 10/0.250	70/streaks of blue,black,brown clay 32.8/sand,gravel, boulders	70/streaks of blue,black,brown clay	291-663	1990	NI/NI
<b>Bethel</b>	305	19	20/0.375 14/0.250	167.5/cemented brown sand 305/coarse brown sand	80/sand & gravel	196-297	1994	YES/YES
<b>BIF</b>	455	153	12/NI 8/NI	384/sticky clay 455/clay	NI	365-455	1960	NI/NI
<b>Broadway</b>	524	74	30/NI 20/NI 12/NI	158/gray clay 353/NI 524/sand	NI	NI	1971	NI/NI
<b>Brookhollow</b>	565	20	12/0.375 10/0.375	479/brown sand 560/gray sand w/small gravel	376/brown & blue clay	479-529 540-550	1976	NI/NI
<b>Byrd</b>	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI/NI
<b>Cartwright</b>	750	280	20/0.250 12/0.250	20/sandy brown clay 550/sandy clay w/pebbles 750/hard basalt	20/sandy brown clay	NI	1976	NI/NI
<b>Cassia #1</b>	590	47	20/0.250 18/0.375 16/0.250 10/0.250	121/blue clay 214/sandy brown clay 195/sandy brown clay 410/silty blue clay	NI	215-240 285-321 357-367 390-400	1990	NI/NI
<b>Centennial</b>	416	98	NI	NI	116/gray clay	NI	1976	NI/NI



Well	Well Depth (ft)	Water Table Depth (ft)	Casing: diameter/ thickness (in)	Casing: depth (ft)/ formation	Surface seal: depth (ft)/ formation	Screened Interval (ft)	Drill Year	Sanitary Survey Elements (A/B) <sup>1</sup>
Central Park	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI/NI
Chamberlain #1	505	25	16/NI 10/NI	170/Shale 505/coarse gray sand	NI	NI	1969	NI/NI
Chamberlain #2	133	17	16/NI	78/NI	NI	NI	1976	NI/NI
Cliffside	480	NI	18/NI	126/NI	NI	NI	NI	NI/NI
Clinton	485	13	20/0.250 18/0.375 10/0.250	49/brown clay 260/blue clay 485/blue sand	50/brown clay	376-473	1990	NI/NI
Cole	565	36	16/0.375 12/0.250	480/med. fine sand 565/coarse sand & gravel	50/clay & sand	480-500 500-560	1977	NI/NI
Country Club	450	90	16/0.375 10/NI	260/sticky blue clay 450/blue clay	20/loose sand & gravel	269-300 344-365 434-440	1980	NI/NI
Country Square	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI/NI
Countryman	500	11	12/0.375 10/0.365	400/brown sand 490/brown clay	100/brown clay	419-429 450-480	1975	NI/NI
Durham	106	41	12/0.375 10/0.250	80/gravel 106/brown clay	20/brown clay	81-91 91-101	1987	YES/YES
Edgeview	550	NI	16/NI	300/clay	20/sand & clay	500-550	1993	NI/NI
Fisk	850	17	20/0.250 18/0.375	125/brown clay 569/brown sand	540/blue clay	NI	1991	NI/NI
Five Mile #12	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI/NI
Floating Feather	346	55	18/0.375 14/0.375	171/light brown clay 204/fine to coarse sand	171/light brown clay	183-193 204-214 225-255	1995	NI/NI
Franklin Park	500	8	16/0.375 14/0.250 10/0.317	384/brown sand 307/blue clay 500/blue clay	21/loose sand, gravel & boulders	413-485	1983	NI/NI
Goddard #2	551	38	20/0.250 18/0.375 16/0.250 10/0.250	100/blue clay 474/brown sand w/clay streaks 455/sticky blue clay 551/blue clay	100/blue clay	474-545	1991	YES/YES
Hidden Valley #1	311	137	12/0.375 10/0.365	261/medium sand 311/loose gravel & sand	79/tan clay	261-301	1972	NI/NI
Hidden Valley #2	320	NI	12/0.285 10/0.365	283/sand & gravel 321/silty coarse sand & gravel	26/yellow sand & clay	283-313	NI	NI/NI
Hillcrest	1005	105	27/0.250 15/0.375	135/blue clay shale sand gravel 536/clay & sandstone	155/blue clay shale sand gravel	NI	1970	NI/NI
Hilton	650	34	20/0.250 18/0.375 10/0.250	40/clay & sandy brown clay 349/blue clay 622/coarse blue sand, pea gravel	150/brown sand	399-420 440-561	1992	NI/NI

Well	Well Depth (ft)	Water Table Depth (ft)	Casing: diameter/ thickness (in)	Casing: depth (ft)/ formation	Surface seal: depth (ft)/ formation	Screened Interval (ft)	Drill Year	Sanitary Survey Elements (A/B) <sup>1</sup>
Hope	444	10	16/NI 10/NI	146/coarse sand, gravel 179/coarse sand & gravel	35/sand, gravel	NI	1989	NI/NI
HP	700	15	20/0.250 18/0.375 16/0.250 10/0.250	47/sandy clay 610/blue silty clay 690/brown sand	375/blue silty clay	598-685	1991?	NI/NI
Hummel	830	39	12/0.312 10/0.312	481/blue shale 798/bue shale	NI	813-823	1958	NI/NI
Idaho	650	35	24/0.250 20/0.375 10/0.365	138/muddy brown sand 281/sticky blue clay 650/sand & clay stringers	261/sticky blue clay	395-425 580-615	1968	NI/NI
Island Wood #1	345	3	16/0.250 10/0.250	226/fine to coarse sand w/pea gravel 325/sandy blue clay	225/brown clay	281-305	1992	NI/NI
Island Wood #2	355	10	16/0.250 10/0.250	245/fine to coarse sand 345/blue clay	139/fine to med. brown sand	243-283 295-315 325-335	1993	NI/NI
JR Flat	567	258	24/0.250 18/0.375 14/0.250 10/0.375	12/broken basalt 427/fine to coarse sand, some gravel 413/brown clay 490/brown clay, streaks of blue-black clay	65/solid basalt	435-486 490-500	1989	NI/NI
Kirkwood	285	50	12/0.375	251/blue sandy clay	NI	NI	1956	NI/NI
LaGrange	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI/NI
Licorice	153 Deepened from 86	45.7	10/0.250 6/0.250	86/NI 110/brown clay	NI	87-102	1983 (deepened)	YES/YES
Logger	538	12	16/0.375 10/0.365	335/blue clay 526/blue clay w/ some sand	118/blue clay	340-360 378-383	1979	NI/NI
Longmeadow	415	18	18/0.375	120/blue clay	NI	NI	1989	NI/NI
M&M	250	23	12/0.250 8/0.322 6/0.250	174/brown clay 190/brown clay 219/dirty sand w/clay chunks	113/sand & gravel	illegible	1997	NI/NI
Mac	525	115	20/0.250 18/0.375 10/0.250	73/sticky brown clay 300/blue gray clay 525/sand	280/brown sandy clay	439-520	1990	NI/NI
Maple Hills	952 deepened from 675	37	18/0.375 10/0.250 16/0.375	349/blue clay 675/blue clay 709/blue clay	24/cemented sand & gravel	619-670	1981 1995	NI/NI

Well	Well Depth (ft)	Water Table Depth (ft)	Casing: diameter/ thickness (in)	Casing: depth (ft)/ formation	Surface seal: depth (ft)/ formation	Screened Interval (ft)	Drill Year	Sanitary Survey Elements (A/B) <sup>1</sup>
Market	944	270	20/0.250 18/0.375	126/dark brown clay 462/cemented sand & gravel	126./dark brown clay	460-470 495-515 600-610 695-705 725-735 760-775 804-814 830-840 892-902	1991	NI/NI
McMillan	610	28	20/0.375 18/0.375 10/0.365	92/NI 325/NI 394/NI	324/NI	NI	1995 1997 reconstructed	NI/NI
Overland	525	60	20/0.250 18/0.375	40/reddish sandy clay 230/silty blue clay & sticky blue clay	230/silty blue clay & sticky blue clay	468-519	1992	NI/NI
Paradise	521	10	10/0.375 6/0.250	436/blue clay 605/sand	405/fine sand & clay streaks	572-600	1977	NI/NI
Pioneer	930	510	18/0.375 10/0.365	681/med. to coarse sand 738/sand & gravel, streaks of clay	681/med. to coarse sand	NI	1998	NI/NI
Pleasant Valley	1000	484	20/0.375	649/clay, white sandy silt	100/gravel, coarse sand, some silt	634-1000	1995	NI/NI
Raptor	865	445	20/0.250 18/0.375	65/cemented sand & gravel 635/sticky brown clay	90/lightly cemented sand & gravel	621-865	1993	NI/NI
Redwood Creek	415	297	18/0.375 12/0.375	281/lt brn clay & some sand 411/clay w/ some sand mix	265/lt brn clay & some sand	298-313	1994	NI/NI
River Run	480	34	20/0.375 18/0.375 16/0.375 10/0.250	70/blue clay 192.5/coarse sand 192/coarse sand 198/coarse sand	70/blue clay	NI	1988	NI/NI
Roosevelt #1	380	NI	16/NI 10/NI	125/NI 380/NI	NI	NI	1982	NI/NI
Roosevelt #3	705	30	16/0.375 10/0.375	402/brown clay 702/blue clay	58/brown clay	486-505 628-648 650-667 669-695	1978	NI/NI
Settlers	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI/NI
Sherman Oaks	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI/NI
Spurwing	385	NI	16/0.250 12/0.250	227/brown sandy clay 272/sand & clay mix	233/brown clay	255-265 272-282 325-355	illegible	NI/NI
Sunset West	620	139	20/0.280 18/0.375 10/0.250	149/cemented sand 314/clay 522/sand	60/broken lava	482-620	1994	NI/NI

Well	Well Depth (ft)	Water Table Depth (ft)	Casing: diameter/ thickness (in)	Casing: depth (ft)/ formation	Surface seal: depth (ft)/ formation	Screened Interval (ft)	Drill Year	Sanitary Survey Elements (A/B) <sup>1</sup>
Swift #1	215	9	20/0.250 16/0.375 14/0.250	62/sticky blue clay 162/fine to coarse slightly cemented sand 190/fine to coarse sand	62/sticky blue clay	163-183 190-210	1978	NI/NI
Swift #2	215	8	20/0.250 18/0.375 10/0.280	63/blue clay 146/streaks of cemented sand & brown clay 214/cemented sand	63/blue clay	157-209	1981	YES/NO
Swift #3	685	10	18/0.375 10/0.365	526/silty blue clay 673/gray clay	526/silty blue clay	551-571 596-663	1997	YES/NO
Taggart #1	447	73	20/0.375 18/0.375	90/blue clay 299/blue clay	299/blue clay	NI	1993	NI/NI
Taggart #2	927	90	20/0.375 18/0.375	91/blue clay 445/blue clay	445/blue clay	NI	1993	NI/NI
Ten Mile	904	495	24/0.250 20/0.375	67/sand, gravel, boulders 700/brown clay	400/sandy brown clay & clay	705-826	1996	NI/NI
Terteling	642	198	26/0.312 16/0.312 12/0.312	46/clay 339/clay 466/brown sand	46/clay	342-362 426-436 466-471	1972	NI/NI
Veterans	277	13	18/0.375 10/0.365	165/grey clay 220/fine to med. sand	164/grey clay	172-254	1996	NI/NI
Victory	570	23	12/0.375 10/0.375	465/blue clay 558/brown & gray clay	illegible	465-470 475-483	1976	NI/NI
Vista	645	95	20/0.250 18/0.375 100.250	74/blue clay 372/sticky blue clay 442/greenish hard shale, sand streaks	75/blue clay	389-409 442-483	1989	NI/NI
Warm Springs Mesa #1	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI/NI
Warm Springs Mesa #2	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI/NI
Warm Springs Mesa #3	443	50	18/0.375	213/NI	213/NI	215-220 245-280 315-330 336-352 356-377 409-419	1992	NI/NI
Westmoreland	890	NI	12/NI 8/NI	285/brown sandy clay 757/blue clay	NI	NI	NI	NI/NI
Willow #1	110	NI	20/NI 16/NI	37/sand & gravel 97/sand	NI	97-110	1962	NI/NI
Willow #2	95	NI	16/NI	55/NI	53/NI	55-95	illegible	NI/NI
Willow #3	110	10	16/0.375	110/very sandy brown clay	NI	68-99	1975	NI/NI

<sup>1</sup> A = Well and surface seal in compliance; B = Protected from surface flooding  
NI = no information was available

The well logs allowed a determination as to whether current public water system (PWS) construction standards are being met. Though the wells may have been in compliance with standards when they were completed, current PWS well construction standards are more stringent. The Idaho Department of Water

Resources *Well Construction Standards Rules* (1993) require all PWSs to follow DEQ standards as well. IDAPA 58.01.08.550 requires that PWSs follow the *Recommended Standards for Water Works* (1997) during construction. Some of the regulations deal with screening requirements, aquifer pump tests, annular seal placement, casing vent requirements, and thickness of casing. Table 1 of the *Recommended Standards for Water Works* (1997) lists the required steel casing thickness for various diameter wells. Six-inch casing requires 0.280-inch thick casing, eight-inch casing requires 0.322-inch thick casing, ten-inch casing requires 0.365-inch thick casing, and 12-inch and larger casing requires a casing thickness of at least 0.375-inches. Three wells (Bali Hai, Countryman, and Redwood Creek) with complete well log information meet this requirement. Many of the wells had no information regarding the geologic unit that the annular seal was placed into. Most of the wells also did not have sanitary surveys to provide information regarding protection from surface flooding. Without this vital system construction information, DEQ gave each well an additional system construction point to be conservative.

### **Potential Contaminant Source and Land Use**

Land use scores vary from low to high for IOCs (i.e. nitrates, arsenic), VOCs (i.e. petroleum products), and SOC (i.e. pesticides), and moderate to low for microbial contaminants (Table 3).

Those well delineations that contain a large number of sources and land use is predominantly urban and commercial rate high for VOCs. Some of the wells with irrigated agriculture as the predominant land use in the 3-year TOT zone have a high rating for IOCs. Additionally, many of the delineations cross priority areas for nitrate, the herbicides atrazine and alachlor, and the VOC PERC, adding to the overall land use score.

Some of the wells that have a limited number of potential contaminant sources within the delineations and/or are surrounded by rangeland rate low for all potential contaminant categories for land use.

Except for the transportation corridors and a few agricultural or solid waste related businesses, there are a limited number of potential contaminant sites that could add microbial contamination to the aquifer. As such, many of the wells rated low land use to microbial contamination.

### **Final Susceptibility Ranking**

A detection above a drinking water standard MCL, any detection of a VOC or SOC, or a detection of total coliform bacteria or fecal coliform bacteria at the wellhead will automatically give a high susceptibility rating to a well despite the land use of the area because a pathway for contamination already exists. Additionally, storing potential contaminant sources within 50 feet of a wellhead will automatically lead to a high susceptibility rating. In this case, several wells rated automatically high for VOCs due to the detection of PERC, TCE, carbon tetrachloride, phenols, or toluene. Other wells rated automatically high for IOCs due to the detection of antimony, fluoride, or thallium above the MCL. The Terteling well rated automatically high for SOC due the detection of the SOC atrazine and the M&M well rated automatically high to microbial contaminants due to the detection of total coliform at the wellhead. Additionally, the Swift #3 well rated automatically high for all potential contaminant categories due to Harbor Lane that runs within 50 feet of the wellhead (Table 3). Hydrologic sensitivity and system construction scores are heavily weighted in the final scores. Having multiple potential contaminant sources in the 0- to 3-year TOT zone (Zone 1B) and agricultural land contribute greatly to the overall ranking. In terms of total susceptibility, 24 wells rated high susceptibility to all potential contaminant categories, 33 wells rated moderate susceptibility to all potential contaminant categories, and eleven wells rated high susceptibility to IOCs, VOCs, and SOC, and rated moderate susceptibility to microbial contaminants. Eight wells rated moderate susceptibility to IOCs, SOC, and microbial contaminants, and rated high susceptibility to VOCs. The



Beacon and Sunset West wells rated high susceptibility to IOCs and moderate susceptibility to VOCs, SOCs, and microbial contaminants. The Cole well rated high susceptibility to VOCs and SOCs, and rated moderate susceptibility to IOCs and microbial contaminants. The Terteling well rated high susceptibility to SOCs and rated a moderate susceptibility to IOCs, VOCs, and microbial contaminants. The M&M well rated high to microbial contaminants and moderate to IOCs, VOCs, and SOCs. The Logger well rated low susceptibility to all potential contaminant categories.

**Table 3. Summary of United Water Wells Susceptibility Evaluation**

Water Source	Susceptibility Scores <sup>1</sup>										Comments
	Hydrologic Sensitivity	Contaminant Inventory				System Construction	Final Susceptibility Ranking				
		IOC	VOC	SOC	Microbial		IOC	VOC	SOC	Microbial	
16 <sup>TH</sup>	M	M	H	M	L	H	H	H	H	H	
27 <sup>th</sup>	M	M	M	M	L	M	M	M	M	M	
Amity	M	M	M	M	L	H	H(*)	H(*)	H	M	Sb=9ppb 6/93, PERC 8/94, Carbon tetrachloride 7/99
Arctic	H	M	H	M	L	H	H(*)	H	H	H	Sb=8ppb 6/93
Bali Hai	M	M	M	M	L	M	M	M	M	M	
Beacon	M	M	M	M	L	M	H*	M	M	M	F=4.23mg/L 8/95
Bergeson	M	L	L	L	L	M	M	M	M	M	
Bethel	H	M	H	M	L	M	H	H(*)	H	H	Phenols 1/95
BIF	M	M	M	M	L	H	H	H	H	H	
Broadway	M	M	M	M	L	H	M	M	M	M	
Brookhollow	M	M	M	M	L	H	H	H	H	M	
Byrd	H	M	M	M	L	H	H	H	H	H	
Cartwright	M	L	L	L	L	M	M	H*	M	M	PERC 6/93
Cassia #1	M	M	H	M	L	H	M	M	M	M	
Centennial	M	M	M	M	L	H	M	M	M	M	
Central Park	H	L	L	L	L	H	H	H	H	H	
Chamberlain #1	M	M	M	M	L	H	H	H(*)	H	M	PERC 8/94
Chamberlain #2	M	M	M	M	L	H	H	H(*)	H	H	PERC 10/94
Cliffside	H	M	M	M	L	H	H	H	H	H	
Clinton	M	M	H	M	L	M	M	M	M	M	
Cole	M	M	M	M	L	H	M	H	H	M	
Country Club	M	M	M	M	L	H	H	H	H	H	
Countryman	M	M	M	M	L	M	M	M	M	M	
Country Square	H	H	M	M	L	H	H	H	H	H	
Durham	H	L	L	L	L	M	M	M	M	M	
Edgeview	M	M	M	M	L	M	M	M	M	M	
Fisk	M	M	H	M	L	M	M	M	M	M	
Five Mile #12	H	M	M	M	L	H	H	H	H	H	
Floating Feather	M	H	M	H	L	M	M	M	M	M	

Water Source	Susceptibility Scores <sup>1</sup>										Comments
	Hydrologic Sensitivity	Contaminant Inventory				System Construction	Final Susceptibility Ranking				
		IOC	VOC	SOC	Microbial		IOC	VOC	SOC	Microbial	
Franklin Park	M	M	H	M	L	H	M	H*	M	M	PERC 8/96-8/98
Goddard #2	M	H	H	M	M	L	M	H*	M	M	PERC 8/93
Hidden Valley #1	H	M	M	M	L	H	H	H	H	H	
Hidden Valley #2	M	H	M	M	L	H	H	H	H	M	
Hillcrest	M	M	M	M	L	M	M	M	M	M	
Hilton	M	M	H	M	L	H	H	H	H	M	
Hope	M	H	M	H	L	H	H	H	H	H	
HP	M	M	M	M	L	M	M	M	M	M	
Hummel	M	H	M	M	L	H	H	H	H	H	
Idaho	M	M	H	M	L	M	M	H*	M	M	PERC 6/93
Island Woods #1	M	M	M	M	L	M	M	M	M	M	
Island Woods #2	M	M	M	M	L	H	M	M	M	M	
JR Flat	M	M	M	M	L	H	M	M	M	M	
Kirkwood	M	M	M	M	L	H	H*	H	H	H	Sb=12ppb 6/93
La Grange	H	M	M	M	L	H	H	H	H	H	
Licorice	M	M	L	L	L	M	M	M	M	M	
Logger	L	L	L	L	L	M	L	L	L	L	
Longmeadow	M	M	M	L	L	H	M	H*	M	M	PERC 9/93-9/99, TCE 9/93-8/99
M&M	M	L	L	L	L	H	M	M	M	H*	TC (10/01)
Mac	M	M	M	M	L	M	M	M	M	M	
Maple Hill	M	M	M	M	L	H	H	H	H	M	
Market	M	M	M	M	L	M	M	M	M	M	
McMillan	H	M	L	L	L	H	H	H*	H	H	Toluene 8/96
Overland	M	M	M	M	L	M	M	M	M	M	
Paradise #1	M	M	M	M	L	H	M	M	M	M	
Pioneer	M	L	L	L	L	H	M	M	M	M	
Pleasant Valley	M	L	L	L	L	H	M	M	M	M	
Raptor	M	L	L	L	L	H	M	M	M	M	
Redwood Creek	M	M	M	M	L	M	M	M	M	M	
River Run	M	M	M	M	L	M	M	M	M	M	
Roosevelt #1	H	M	H	M	L	H	H(*)	H	H	H	Sb=10ppb 6/93
Roosevelt #3	M	M	H	M	L	M	M	H*	M	M	PERC 12/92, TCE 12/92
Settlers	H	M	M	M	L	H	H	H	H	H	
Sherman Oaks	H	M	M	M	L	H	H	H	H	H	
Spurwing	M	M	L	M	L	M	M	M	M	M	
Sunset West	M	M	M	M	L	H	H*	M	M	M	Tl=6ppb 3/94
Swift #1	M	M	H	M	L	M	M	H*	M	M	PERC 10/94

Water Source	Susceptibility Scores <sup>1</sup>										Comments
	Hydrologic Sensitivity	Contaminant Inventory				System Construction	Final Susceptibility Ranking				
		IOC	VOC	SOC	Microbial		IOC	VOC	SOC	Microbial	
Swift #2	H	M	H	M	L	M	M	H*	M	M	PERC 6/93-2/01, TCE 6/93-2/01
Swift #3	M	M	M	M	L	M	H*	H*	H*	H*	
Taggart #1	M	M	M	M	L	M	M	M	M	M	
Taggart #2	M	M	M	M	L	M	M	M	M	M	
Ten Mile	M	L	L	L	L	M	M	M	M	M	
Terteling	M	L	L	L	L	M	M	M	H*	M	Atrazine 7/94
Veteran's	M	M	H	M	L	M	M	M	M	M	
Victory	M	M	M	M	L	H	H	H	H	M	
Vista	M	M	M	M	L	M	M	M	M	M	
Warm Springs Mesa #1	M	M	M	M	L	H	H	H	H	M	
Warm Springs Mesa #2	M	M	M	M	L	H	H	H	H	M	
Warm Springs Mesa #3	M	M	M	M	L	H	H	H	H	M	
Westmoreland	M	M	M	M	L	H	H	H*	H	M	PERC 8/97, 9/00
Willow Lane #1	M	M	H	M	L	H	H	H	H	H	
Willow Lane #2	M	M	H	M	L	H	H	H	H	H	
Willow Lane #3	M	M	H	M	L	H	H	H	H	H	

<sup>1</sup>H = High Susceptibility, M = Moderate Susceptibility, L = Low Susceptibility,

IOC = inorganic chemical, VOC = volatile organic chemical, SOC = synthetic organic chemical

\* = Automatic high score due to a detection of an IOC above the MCL, or any detection of a SOC or a VOC, or any potential contaminant source within 50 feet of the wellhead

(\*) = Automatic high score as well as a high overall point total

Sb = antimony, Tl = thallium, F = fluoride, PERC = perchloroethylene, TCE = trichloroethylene, ppb = parts per billion, ppm = parts per million

MCLs: Sb = 6 ppb; Tl = 2 ppb; F = 4 ppm

## Susceptibility Summary

In terms of total susceptibility, 24 United Water Idaho wells rated high susceptibility to all potential contaminant categories, 33 wells rated moderate to all potential contaminant categories, eleven wells rated high susceptibility to IOCs, VOCs, and SOCs, and rated moderate susceptibility to microbial contaminants. Eight wells rated moderate susceptibility to IOCs, SOCs, and microbial contaminants, and rated high susceptibility to VOCs. The Beacon and Sunset West wells rated high susceptibility to IOCs and moderate susceptibility to VOCs, SOCs, and microbial contaminants. The Cole well rated high susceptibility to VOCs and SOCs, and rated moderate susceptibility to IOCs and microbial contaminants. The Terteling well rated high susceptibility to SOCs and rated a moderate susceptibility to IOCs, VOCs, and microbial contaminants. The M&M well rated high for microbial contaminants and moderate to IOCs, VOCs, and SOCs. The Logger well rated low susceptibility to all potential contaminant categories.

Several wells have an automatic high susceptibility to one or more of the potential contaminant categories due to the detection of any VOC or SOC, the detection of an IOC above its MCL, the detection of coliform bacteria at the wellhead, or the location of a potential contaminant source within 50 feet of the wellhead. Fourteen wells have an automatic high susceptibility to VOCs due to the detection of PERC, TCE, phenols, and/or carbon tetrachloride. The Terteling well has a high susceptibility to SOCs due to the detection of atrazine. Six wells have an automatic high susceptibility to IOCs due to the detection of antimony, fluoride, or thallium at levels above the MCLs. The M&M well has an automatic high susceptibility to microbials due to the detection of total coliform at the wellhead and the Swift #3 well has an automatic high susceptibility to all potential contaminant categories due to the location of Harbor Lane within 50 feet of the wellhead. The comments column of Table 3 provides the detection date of each contaminant and for the IOCs the detected amount.

Well logs were not available for nine of the 82 wells of United Water Idaho and sanitary surveys were available for only six of the wells. Sanitary surveys are the usual source of information regarding surface flooding protection and wellhead seal requirements. This lack of information increased the hydrologic sensitivity and the system construction scores, contributing to many of the high susceptibility ratings of the wells. If these sources of information could be provided, the overall scores would likely drop for the wells.

Current water chemistry problems that affect the United Water Idaho water system pertain to the detection of the VOCs PERC, TCE, toluene, phenols, and carbon tetrachloride, the SOC atrazine, and the detection of the IOCs fluoride, antimony, arsenic, and thallium at levels above the MCL. Additionally, total coliform bacteria were detected at the M&M well in October 2001. See Appendix C, Table 76 for a summary of all of the detected contaminants in each well.

Between 1992 and 2001, the VOC PERC was detected in twelve wells. PERC is usually associated with dry cleaning businesses. It can cause liver problems and an increased risk of cancer. Also between 1992 and 2001, TCE was detected in the three wells. TCE is associated with discharge from oil refineries and it can also cause liver problems and an increased risk of cancer. Another VOC, carbon tetrachloride was detected in the Amity well in 1999. This contaminant is associated with industrial plants such as chemical plants. As with the other VOCs, it can cause liver problems and an increased risk of cancer. Phenols (VOCs) have been detected in the Bethel well in 1995. Phenols are used as petroleum solvents, disinfectants, and antiseptics. If ingested, phenols can cause gastrointestinal disruption including vomiting, cramps, and diarrhea, renal failure, and liver damage. Toluene was detected in the McMillan well in 1996. Toluene is associated with discharges from petroleum businesses or factories. It can cause kidney, nervous system, and liver problems.

In 1994, the SOC atrazine was detected in the Terteling well. Atrazine is used as a herbicide and can cause cardiovascular system problems and reproductive difficulties.

The IOC antimony was detected in 1993 in four wells at levels above the MCL of 6 parts per billion (ppb). Antimony is usually associated with petroleum refineries or fire retardants and if ingested can increase blood cholesterol and decrease blood glucose. Fluoride was detected in the Beacon well in 1995 at 4.23 parts per million (ppm), slightly above the MCL of 4 ppm. In extreme cases, fluoride can cause bone disease. Thallium was detected in the Sunset West well in 1994 at 6 ppb. The MCL for Thallium is 2 ppb. Thallium can cause hair loss, liver and kidney problems, and changes in the blood. See the comments column of Table 3.

Arsenic, an IOC, was also detected in the United Water wells listed below at levels above the newly revised MCL of 10 ppb. In October 2001, the EPA reduced the arsenic MCL from 50 ppb to 10 ppb, giving public water systems (PWSs) until 2006 to comply with the new standard. Twelve of the 82 wells have had recorded arsenic levels at or above 10 ppb between 1990 and 2001. These wells are: Bali Hai, Bergeson, Centennial, Central Park, Cartwright, Franklin Park, JR Flat, Market, Warm Springs Mesa #3, Swift #1, Vista, and Willow Lane #1. Since the elevated levels of arsenic detected in the wells did not result in an automatic high susceptibility score, arsenic detections are not listed in Table 3. See Appendix C for more information.

In October 2001, total coliform bacteria were detected at the wellhead of the M&M well. In addition, total coliform bacteria have been detected in the distribution system between 1998 and 2001, indicating a possible existing pathway for contamination.

Possibly associated with the total coliform detected in the system, trihalomethanes (disinfection by-products) have been detected in the United Water wells. These contaminants are not considered problems with the source water but they are of concern due to their apparent health threat. The trihalomethanes detected include bromodichloromethane, bromoform, chloroform, chlorodibromomethane. These disinfection by-products are formed when the chlorine or bromine reacts with natural organic matter (NOM). The formation of by-products is also affected by other factors such as pH, temperature, and dose of disinfectant. Trihalomethanes can cause an increased risk of cancer, liver, kidney, and nervous system problems in long term exposure.

As urban land use is predominant around many of the United Water Idaho wells, 23 delineations cross a priority area of the VOC PERC. However, some of the wells are surrounded by agricultural land with 17 delineations crossing a nitrate priority area and 18 delineations crossing a priority area for the pesticides atrazine and alachlor.

## **Section 4. Options for Drinking Water Protection**

The susceptibility assessment should be used as a basis for determining appropriate new protection measures or re-evaluating existing protection efforts. No matter what the susceptibility ranking a source receives, protection is always important. Whether the source is currently located in a “pristine” area or an area with numerous industrial and/or agricultural land uses that require surveillance, the way to ensure good water quality in the future is to act now to protect valuable water supply resources.

An effective drinking water protection program is tailored to the particular local drinking water protection area. A community with a fully developed drinking water protection program will incorporate many strategies. For United Water Idaho, drinking water protection activities should first focus on documenting the maintenance of the well seal, sanitary seal, and flood protection. This information is usually found on sanitary surveys. These surveys are currently not required for large systems that test for microbial contamination more than five times per month.

As many of the delineations cover predominantly urban areas, there should be a strong public education program to make people aware that they live above their source of drinking water. Additionally, storm water practices should be assessed. Since some of the well delineations cross agricultural land uses, there should be a focus on implementation of practices aimed at reducing the leaching of agricultural chemicals from agricultural land within the designated source water areas.

No potential contaminants, including roads, houses, or construction sites, should be allowed within 50 feet of any of the wellheads. If possible, United Water Idaho may need to consider limiting the use of Harbor Lane that lies within 50 feet of Swift #3 well to reduce the risk of spills or releases associated with these potential contaminant sources.

Since some of the wells overlie PERC plumes, United Water Idaho may need to implement or upgrade engineering controls to reduce the detection of VOCs and SOCs in the water system. Engineering controls may be helpful in reducing the amount of IOCs such as arsenic, thallium, antimony, and fluoride detected in the wells as well.

Should microbial contamination become a problem, appropriate disinfection practices would need to be maintained in a way to protect the drinking water from VOC by-products produced by the disinfection process. Though water cannot be totally free of by-products when disinfection is used, they can be reduced by treatment modifications. See [www.epa.gov](http://www.epa.gov) for more information

Much of the designated protection areas are outside the direct jurisdiction of the United Water Idaho, making collaboration and partnerships with the City of Boise, the City of Nampa, state and local agencies, and industry groups critical to the success of drinking water protection. All wells should maintain sanitary standards regarding wellhead protection. If the system should need to expand in the future, new well sites should be located in areas with as few potential sources of contamination as possible, and the site should be reserved and protected for this specific use.

Due to the time involved with the movement of ground water, drinking water protection activities should be aimed at long-term management strategies even though these strategies may not yield results in the near term. A strong public education program should be a primary focus of any drinking water protection plan as the delineation contains some urban and residential land uses. Public education topics could include proper lawn and garden care practices, household hazardous waste disposal methods, proper care and maintenance of septic systems, and the importance of water conservation to name but a few. There are multiple resources available to help communities implement protection programs, including the Drinking Water Program of the EPA. As there are transportation corridors through the delineations, the Idaho Department of Transportation should be involved in protection activities. Drinking water protection activities for agriculture should be coordinated with the Idaho State Department of Agriculture, the Soil Conservation Commission, the Ada Soil and Water Conservation District, the Canyon Soil Conservation District, and the Natural Resources Conservation Service.

A community must incorporate a variety of strategies in order to develop a comprehensive drinking water assessment protection plan, be they regulatory in nature (i.e. zoning, permitting) or non-regulatory in nature (i.e. good housekeeping, public education, specific best management practices). For assistance in developing protection strategies please contact the Boise Regional Office of the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality.

Any new wells that are installed as public water systems (PWSs) are required to follow current well construction standards. The Idaho Department of Water Resources *Well Construction Standards Rules* (1993) require all PWSs to follow DEQ standards as well. IDAPA 58.01.08.550 requires that PWSs follow the *Recommended Standards for Water Works* (1997) during construction.

## **Assistance**

Public water supplies and others may call the following DEQ offices with questions about this assessment and to request assistance with developing and implementing a local protection plan. In addition, draft protection plans may be submitted to the DEQ office for preliminary review and comments.

Boise Regional DEQ Office                      (208) 373-0550

State DEQ Office                                      (208) 373-0502

Website: <http://www.deq.state.id.us>

Water suppliers serving fewer than 10,000 persons may contact Melinda Harper (mlharper@idahoruralwater.com), Idaho Rural Water Association, at (208) 343-7001 for assistance with drinking water protection (formerly wellhead protection) strategies.

# POTENTIAL CONTAMINANT INVENTORY

## LIST OF ACRONYMS AND DEFINITIONS

**AST (Aboveground Storage Tanks)** – Sites with aboveground storage tanks.

**Business Mailing List** – This list contains potential contaminant sites identified through a yellow pages database search of standard industry codes (SIC).

**CERCLIS** – This includes sites considered for listing under the **Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA)**. CERCLA, more commonly known as ASuperfund®, is designed to clean up hazardous waste sites that are on the national priority list (NPL).

**Cyanide Site** – DEQ permitted and known historical sites/facilities using cyanide.

**Dairy** – Sites included in the primary contaminant source inventory represent those facilities regulated by Idaho State Department of Agriculture (ISDA) and may range from a few head to several thousand head of milking cows.

**Deep Injection Well** – Injection wells regulated under the Idaho Department of Water Resources generally for the disposal of stormwater runoff or agricultural field drainage.

**Enhanced Inventory** – Enhanced inventory locations are potential contaminant source sites added by the water system. These can include new sites not captured during the primary contaminant inventory, or corrected locations for sites not properly located during the primary contaminant inventory. Enhanced inventory sites can also include miscellaneous sites added by the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) during the primary contaminant inventory.

**Floodplain** – This is a coverage of the 100year floodplains.

**Group 1 Sites** – These are sites that show elevated levels of contaminants and are not within the priority one areas.

**Inorganic Priority Area** – Priority one areas where greater than 25% of the wells/springs show constituents higher than primary standards or other health standards.

**Landfill** – Areas of open and closed municipal and non-municipal landfills.

**LUST (Leaking Underground Storage Tank)** – Potential contaminant source sites associated with leaking underground storage tanks as regulated under RCRA.

**Mines and Quarries** – Mines and quarries permitted through the Idaho Department of Lands.)

**Nitrate Priority Area** – Area where greater than 25% of wells/springs show nitrate values above 5mg/l.

**NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System)** – Sites with NPDES permits. The Clean Water Act requires that any discharge of a pollutant to waters of the United States from a point source must be authorized by an NPDES permit.

**Organic Priority Areas** – These are any areas where greater than 25 % of wells/springs show levels greater than 1% of the primary standard or other health standards.

**Recharge Point** – This includes active, proposed, and possible recharge sites on the Snake River Plain.

**RICRIS** – Site regulated under **Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA)**. RCRA is commonly associated with the cradle to grave management approach for generation, storage, and disposal of hazardous wastes.

**SARA Tier II (Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act Tier II Facilities)** – These sites store certain types and amounts of hazardous materials and must be identified under the Community Right to Know Act.

**Toxic Release Inventory (TRI)** – The toxic release inventory list was developed as part of the Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know (Community Right to Know) Act passed in 1986. The Community Right to Know Act requires the reporting of any release of a chemical found on the TRI list.

**UST (Underground Storage Tank)** – Potential contaminant source sites associated with underground storage tanks regulated as regulated under RCRA.

**Wastewater Land Applications Sites** – These are areas where the land application of municipal or industrial wastewater is permitted by DEQ.

**Wellheads** – These are drinking water well locations regulated under the Safe Drinking Water Act. They are not treated as potential contaminant sources.

**NOTE:** Many of the potential contaminant sources were located using a geocoding program where mailing addresses are used to locate a facility. Field verification of potential contaminant sources is an important element of an enhanced inventory.

Where possible, a list of potential contaminant sites unable to be located with geocoding will be provided to water systems to determine if the potential contaminant sources are located within the source water assessment area.



## References Cited

- Anderson, J.E. and Wood, S.H., 1981. Geological, Hydrological Geochemical and Geophysical Investigations of the Meridian-Meridian and Adjacent Areas, Southwestern Idaho. Chapter 3, Geohydrology, In: Mitchell, J. C., ed., Geothermal Investigations in Idaho, Part 11: Idaho Department of Water Resources, Water Information Bulletin 30: p. 33-42.
- Clemens, D.M., 1993. Volcanic stratigraphy and tectonic development, Western Snake River Plain, Idaho. M.S. Thesis, Arizona State University.
- Great Lakes-Upper Mississippi River Board of State and Provincial Public Health and Environmental Managers, 1997. "Recommended Standards for Water Works."
- Idaho Department of Agriculture, 1998. Unpublished Data.
- Idaho Department of Environmental Quality, 1997. Design Standards for Public Drinking Water Systems. IDAPA 58.01.08.550.01.
- Idaho Department of Water Resources, 1993. Administrative Rules of the Idaho Water Resource Board: Well Construction Standards Rules. IDAPA 37.03.09.
- Malde, H.E., 1991. Quaternary geology and structural history of the Snake River Plain, Idaho and Oregon. In: The Geology of North America, Quaternary Nonglacial Geology: Conterminous U.S., Vol. K-2, 252-281 pp.
- Malde, H.E. and Powers, H.A., 1962. Upper Cenozoic stratigraphy of Western Snake River Plain. Geological Society of America Bulletin, 73: 1197-1220.
- Neely, K.W. and J.K. Crockett, 1998. "Ground Water Quality Characterization and Initial Trend Analyses for the Treasure Valley Shallow and Deep Hydrogeologic Subareas," Idaho Department of Water Resources, Water Information Bulletin No. 50, Part 3.
- Norton, M.A., W. Ondrechen, and J.L. Baggs. 1982. *Ground Water Investigation of the Mountain Home Plateau, Idaho*. Idaho Department of Water Resources. Open File Report August 1982.
- Othberg, K.L., 1994. Geology and geomorphology of the Boise Valley and adjoining areas, western Snake River Plain, Idaho. Idaho Geological Survey Bulletin 29: 54 pp.
- Othberg, K.L. and Stanford, L., 1992. Geologic map of the Boise Valley and adjoining area, Western Snake River Plain, Idaho. Idaho Geological Survey.
- Petrich, C.R. and S.M. Urban, 1996. "Treasure Valley Hydrologic Project Background – Draft," September, 1996.
- Petrich, C.R. and J.H. Hutchings (IWRRI), S.M. Urban and R.A. Carlson (IDWR), 1999. "Progress Report on the Characterization of Treasure Valley Ground Water Resources – Draft," prepared for and in cooperation with the Idaho Department of Water Resources, June 30, 1999.

- Ralston, D.R. and S.L. Chapman. 1968. *Ground Water Resources in the Mountain Home Area, Elmore County, Idaho*. Idaho Department of Reclamation. Water Information Bulletin #4. 63 pages.
- Ralston, D.R. and S.L. Chapman. 1970. *Ground Water Resources of Southern Ada County and Western Elmore County, Idaho*. Idaho Department of Reclamation. Water Information Bulletin #15. 52 pages.
- Squires, E., Wood, S.H. and Osiensky, J.L., 1992. Hydrogeologic Framework of the Boise Aquifer System, Ada County, Idaho, Research Technical Completion Report, Idaho Water Resources Research Institute, University of Idaho. 114 pp.
- Wood, S.H., 1994. Seismic expression and geological significance of a lacustrine delta in Neogene deposits of the Western Snake River Plain, Idaho. AAPG Bulletin, 1(January): p. 102-121.
- Wood, S.H. and Anderson, J.E., 1981. Part 11: Geological, hydrological, and geochemical and Geophysical investigations of the Meridian-Meridian and adjacent areas, southwestern Idaho. In: J.C. Mitchell (Editor), Geothermal investigations in Idaho. Idaho Department of Water Resources.
- Wuolo, R.W., J. Wittman, and D.M. Reynolds, 2001. "Summary Report: Delineation of Public Drinking Water Sources for the Source Water Assessment Program: Boise Valley and Mountain Home Plateau," BARR, Minneapolis, August 2001.
- Young, H.W. 1977. *Reconnaissance of Ground Water Resources in the Mountain Home Plateau Area, Southwest Idaho*. U.S. Geological Survey. Water Resources Investigations 77-108, Open File Report. 40 pages.

# Appendix A

United Water Idaho

Figures 2 through 75

Appendix B

United Water Idaho

Potential Contaminant Inventories

Tables 4 - 75

## Appendix C

### Table 76 Summary of Contaminants for the United Water Idaho Wells

### Detection of Contaminants in the United Water Wells

- Detection of VOC or SOC, and IOC's above the MCLs (except for arsenic);
- Detection of trihalomethanes or arsenic above the current MCL;
- Detection of IOC's below the MCLs

16th	27 <sup>th</sup>	Amity	Arctic
aluminum	calcium	aluminum	aluminum
cadmium	chloride	antimony: 9 ppb (6/93)	antimony: 8 ppb (6/93)
calcium	copper	bromodichloromethane: (12/92, 8/94, 2/00)	chlorodibromomethane: (8/96)
chloride	fluoride	bromoform: (8/94, 2/00)	calcium
fluoride	iron	calcium	chloride
iron	magnesium	chloride	copper
magnesium	potassium	chlorodibromomethane: (9/93, 2/00)	cyanide
manganese	sulfate	copper	fluoride
nitrate		fluoride	iron
potassium		iron	magnesium
lead		magnesium	manganese
sulfate		potassium	nitrate
		PERC: (8/94)	potassium
		carbon tetrachloride: (7/99)	sulfate
		trihalomethanes: (12/92- 2/00)	
Bali Hai	Beacon	Bergeson	Bethel
aluminum	calcium	aluminum	aluminum
arsenic: 6 ppb (7/95)	chloride	calcium	arsenic
calcium	iron	chloride	calcium
chloride	magnesium	fluoride	chloride
fluoride	manganese	iron	copper
iron	potassium	magnesium	fluoride
magnesium	sulfate	nitrate	iron
manganese	fluoride: 4.23 ppm (8/95)	potassium	magnesium
nitrate	chlorodibromomethane: (9/93)	selenium	nitrate
potassium	chloroform: (6/93, 9/93)	sulfate	potassium
sulfate		mercury	sulfate
chlorodibromomethane: (6/93)		arsenic: 29 ppb (6/90), 43 ppb (6/93), 22 ppb (8/97)	phenols: (1/95)
		bromoform: (9/93)	
BIF	Broadway	Brook Hollow	Byrd
arsenic	antimony	calcium	arsenic
calcium	arsenic	chloride	calcium
chloride	calcium	fluoride	chloride
fluoride	chloride	magnesium	fluoride
iron	fluoride	manganese	iron
magnesium	magnesium	nitrate	manganese
nitrate	potassium	potassium	sulfate
potassium	sulfate	sulfate	
sulfate			
bromoform: (6/94)			
chlorodibromomethane: (6/94)			
Cartwright	Cassia #1	Centennial	Central Park
aluminum	aluminum	aluminum	calcium
cadmium	barium	calcium	chloride
calcium	cadmium	chloride	fluoride
chloride	chloride	fluoride	iron
fluoride	fluoride	iron	magnesium

Cartwright	Cassia #1	Centennial	Central Park
magnesium	iron	magnesium	manganese
nitrate	magnesium	nitrate	nitrate
potassium	manganese	potassium	potassium
sulfate	nitrate	sulfate	sulfate
arsenic: 14 ppb (6/91)	potassium	zinc	zinc
PERC: (6/93)	lead		arsenic: 13 ppb (6/91), 14 ppb (6/92)
	sulfate		chlorodibromomethane: (12/93)
	zinc		
	chlorodibromomethane: (9/93)		
	bromoform: (9/93)		
Chamberlain #1	Chamberlain #2	Cliffside	Clinton
arsenic	arsenic	calcium	aluminum
calcium	calcium	chloride	calcium
chloride	chloride	fluoride	chloride
cyanide	fluoride	iron	fluoride
fluoride	iron	magnesium	iron
iron	magnesium	manganese	magnesium
magnesium	manganese	nitrate	manganese
manganese	nitrate	potassium	nitrate
nitrate	potassium	sulfate	potassium
potassium	sulfate	bromodichloromethane: (7/99)	lead
zinc	PERC: (10/94, 9/96, 8/97, 11/98)	chlorodibromomethane: (7/99)	sulfate
mercury	bromodichloromethane (12/93)		zinc
PERC: (8/94)	chlorodibromomethane (12/93)		
Cole	Country Club	Country Man	Country Square
aluminum	aluminum	nitrate	chloride
calcium	antimony	sulfate	fluoride
chloride	cadmium		magnesium
copper	calcium		nitrate
cyanide	chloride		potassium
fluoride	copper		sulfate
iron	fluoride		
magnesium	magnesium		
manganese	nitrate		
nitrate	potassium		
potassium	selenium		
sulfate	sulfate		
	chromium		
	bromodichloromethane: (8/00)		
	chlorodibromomethane (8/96, 8/00)		
Durham	Edgeview	Fisk	Five Mile #12
	barium	aluminum	barium
	calcium	calcium	calcium
	chloride	chloride	chloride
	fluoride	fluoride	fluoride
	iron	magnesium	magnesium
	magnesium	manganese	nitrate
	manganese	nitrate	potassium

Durham	Edgeview	Fisk	Five Mile #12
	potassium	potassium	sulfate
	sulfate	sulfate	
Floating Feather	Franklin Park	Goddard #2	Hidden Valley #1
aluminum	aluminum	aluminum	nitrate
arsenic	calcium	arsenic	sulfate
calcium	chloride	calcium	bromoform: (8/00)
chloride	fluoride	chloride	
fluoride	magnesium	fluoride	
magnesium	nitrate	iron	
nitrate	potassium	magnesium	
potassium	sulfate	manganese	
sulfate	arsenic: 11 ppb (6/93)	nitrate	
	bromodichloromethane: (6/93, 8/98)	potassium	
	bromoform: (6/93., 8/96, 4/97)	sulfate	
	chlorodibromomethane: (6/93, 8/96, 8/98)	zinc	
	PERC: (8/96, 8/97, 10/97, 8/98)	bromoform: (6/93)	
		chlorodibromomethane: 6/93, 9/93)	
		PERC: (6/93)	
Hidden Valley #2	Hillcrest	Hilton	Hope
nitrate	aluminum	aluminum	aluminum
sulfate	antimony	antimony	barium
	barium	calcium	calcium
	calcium	chloride	chloride
	chloride	cyanide	copper
	copper	fluoride	fluoride
	fluoride	iron	iron
	iron	magnesium	magnesium
	magnesium	manganese	manganese
	manganese	nitrate	nitrate
	nitrate	potassium	potassium
	potassium	sulfate	selenium
	sulfate	zinc	sulfate
	chlorodibromomethane: (9/93)	mercury	zinc
		bromodichloromethane: (9/93)	uranium
		chlorodibromomethane: (9/93)	mercury
			bromoform: (6/93)
			chlorodibromomethane: (6/93)
HP	Hummel	Idaho	Island Woods #1
aluminum	aluminum	aluminum	iron
antimony	barium	calcium	sulfate
cadmium	calcium	chloride	
calcium	chloride	copper	
chloride	copper	fluoride	
fluoride	fluoride	magnesium	
magnesium	iron	manganese	
nitrate	magnesium	potassium	
potassium	manganese	sulfate	
lead	nitrate	PERC: (6/93)	



HP	Hummel	Idaho	Island Woods #1
sulfate	potassium		
zinc	lead		
	sulfate		
	zinc		
	bromodichloromethane: (7/94)		
	chlorodibromomethane: (7/94)		
Island Woods #2	JR Flat	Kirkwood	La Grange
Iron	aluminum	aluminum	arsenic
sulfate	cadmium	calcium	barium
	calcium	chloride	calcium
	chloride	copper	chloride
	copper	fluoride	sulfate
	fluoride	magnesium	zinc
	magnesium	nitrate	fluoride
	nitrate	potassium	magnesium
	potassium	sulfate	nitrate
	sulfate	antimony: 12 ppb (6/93)	potassium
	chromium	bromodichloromethane: (6/93, 9/96)	
	arsenic: 10 ppb (1/90)	bromoform: (6/93, 9/96)	
		chlorodibromomethane: (6/93, 9/96)	
Licorice	Logger	Longmeadow	M&M
	aluminum	aluminum	
	arsenic	arsenic	
	calcium	calcium	
	chloride	chloride	
	fluoride	fluoride	
	iron	iron	
	magnesium	magnesium	
	manganese	nitrate	
	potassium	potassium	
	sulfate	sulfate	
		PERC: (9/93-8/99)	
		TCE: (9/93-8/99)	
Mac	Maple Hill	Market	McMillan
arsenic	aluminum	calcium	aluminum
calcium	calcium	chloride	arsenic
chloride	chloride	fluoride	barium
fluoride	fluoride	magnesium	calcium
iron	iron	nitrate	chloride
manganese	magnesium	potassium	fluoride
nitrate	manganese	selenium	iron
lead	nitrate	sulfate	magnesium
sulfate	potassium	arsenic: 14 ppb (10/97), 15 ppb (7/00)	manganese
mercury	sulfate		nitrate
	chromium		potassium
			sulfate
			zinc
			mercury
			toluene: (8/96)
Overland	Paradise	Pioneer	Pleasant Valley
aluminum	nitrate	aluminum	aluminum

Overland	Paradise	Pioneer	Pleasant Valley
calcium	sulfate	arsenic	antimony
chloride		copper	arsenic
fluoride		fluoride	barium
iron		iron	cadmium
magnesium		magnesium	calcium
manganese		nitrate	chloride
nitrate		sulfate	copper
potassium			cyanide
sulfate			fluoride
			iron
			magnesium
			manganese
			nitrate
			potassium
			selenium
			sulfate
			zinc
			mercury
			chromium
			nickel
			thallium
			bromoform: (9/96)
Raptor	Redwood Creek	Roosevelt #1	Roosevelt #3
aluminum	calcium	aluminum	aluminum
barium	chloride	arsenic	cadmium
calcium	fluoride	calcium	calcium
chloride	iron	chloride	chloride
fluoride	magnesium	fluoride	fluoride
iron	manganese	iron	iron
magnesium	nitrate	magnesium	magnesium
manganese	potassium	manganese	manganese
nitrate	sulfate	nitrate	nitrate
potassium		potassium	potassium
sulfate		sulfate	selenium
zinc		antimony: 10 ppb (6/93)	sulfate
chromium		bromoform: (6/93, 7/94)	bromodichloromethane: (9/94)
bromoform: (6/00)			chlorodibromomethane: (9/94)
chlorodibromomethane: (6/00)			PERC: (12/92)
			TCE: (12/92)
Settlers	Sherman Oaks	Spurwing	Sunset West
aluminum		barium	aluminum
arsenic		calcium	arsenic
barium		chloride	calcium
calcium		fluoride	chloride
chloride		iron	fluoride
copper		magnesium	magnesium
cyanide		nitrate	nitrate
fluoride		potassium	potassium
iron		sulfate	sulfate
magnesium			mercury
manganese			antimony: 11 ppb (6/93)
nitrate			thallium: 6 ppb (3/94)
potassium			

lead			
Settlers	Sherman Oaks	Spurwing	Sunset West
sulfate			
chlorodibromomethane: (9/93)			
chloroform: (9/93)			
Swift #1	Swift #2	Swift #3	Taggart #1
barium	barium	calcium	aluminum
calcium	cadmium	chloride	arsenic
chloride	calcium	fluoride	calcium
copper	chloride	iron	chloride
fluoride	fluoride	magnesium	fluoride
iron	iron	manganese	iron
magnesium	magnesium	potassium	magnesium
manganese	manganese	sulfate	manganese
nitrate	nitrate		nitrate
potassium	potassium		potassium
sulfate	sulfate		sulfate
arsenic: 8 ppb (6/92), 11 ppb (7/00)	chloroform: (7/94)		chromium
bromodichloromethane: (7/01)	PERC: (6/93-2/01)		
chlorodibromomethane: (7/01)	TCE: (6/93)		
chloroform: (7/01)			
PERC: (10/94)			
Taggart #2	Ten Mile	Terteling	Veterans
calcium	arsenic	aluminum	aluminum
chloride	calcium	calcium	arsenic
fluoride	chloride	chloride	barium
iron	bromoform: (9/96)	fluoride	beryllium
magnesium	fluoride	magnesium	calcium
nitrate	magnesium	manganese	chloride
potassium	nitrate	nitrate	fluoride
sulfate	potassium	potassium	iron
zinc	sulfate	sulfate	magnesium
	mercury	arsenic: 11 ppb (8/97)	nitrate
	chromium	bromoform: (9/93)	potassium
		chloroform: (7/94, 8/98)	lead
		atrazine: (7/94)	sulfate
			zinc
Victory	Vista	Warm Springs Mesa #1	Warm Springs Mesa #2
	antimony		arsenic
	calcium		nitrate
	chloride		sulfate
	mercury		
	arsenic: 12 ppb (6/92)		
	bromodichloromethane: (9/00)		
	chlorodibromomethane: (9/00)		
Warm Springs Mesa #3	Westmoreland	Willow Lane #1	Willow Lane #2
fluoride	aluminum	calcium	aluminum
iron	calcium	chloride	arsenic
sulfate	chloride	fluoride	calcium
arsenic: 11 ppb (9/00), 10 ppb (2/01)	fluoride	iron	chloride
	iron	magnesium	fluoride

	magnesium	manganese	magnesium
Warm Springs Mesa #3	Westmoreland	Willow Lane #1	Willow Lane #2
	manganese	nitrate	nitrate
	potassium	potassium	potassium
	sulfate	sulfate	sulfate
	bromodichloromethane: (9/93)	arsenic: 11 ppb (8/97)	
	chlorodibromomethane (9/93, 9/00)		
	chloroform: (9/93)		
	PERC: (8/97, 9/00)		
Willow Lane #3	Distribution System		
aluminum	aluminum		
calcium	barium		
chloride	calcium		
fluoride	chloride		
magnesium	fluoride		
nitrate	iron		
potassium	magnesium		
sulfate	manganese		
zinc	nitrate		
	potassium		
	1,1,1-trichloroethane: (6/94)		

ppb = parts per billion, ppm = parts per million, PERC = perchloroethylene or tetrachloroethylene, TCE = trichloroethylene  
MCLs: Antimony = 6 ppb, thallium = 2 ppb, fluoride = 4 ppm

## Appendix D

### United Water Idaho Susceptibility Analysis Worksheets

The final scores for the susceptibility analysis were determined using the following formulas:

- 1) VOC/SOC/IOC Final Score = Hydrologic Sensitivity + System Construction + (Potential Contaminant/Land Use x 0.2)
- 2) VOC/SOC/IOC Final Score = Hydrologic Sensitivity + System Construction + (Potential Contaminant/Land Use x 0.273) For the Cartwright, Central Park, M&M, and Spurwing wells
- 3) Microbial Final Score = Hydrologic Sensitivity + System Construction + (Potential Contaminant/Land Use x 0.375)

Final Susceptibility Scoring:

0 - 5 Low Susceptibility

6 - 12 Moderate Susceptibility

≥ 13 High Susceptibility

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	5/29/57				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO			1	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				6	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	57	72	73	9
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	14	23	10	
4 Points Maximum		4	4	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	0	2	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		12	14	12	8
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		19	21	19	10
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		14	14	14	14
5. Final Well Ranking		High	High	High	High

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	4/10/97				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES			0	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				3	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES			0	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				2	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	41	47	55	6
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	4	21	5	
4 Points Maximum		4	4	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		12	12	12	8
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		19	19	19	10
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		9	9	9	9
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate



1. System Construction		SCORE			
	Drill Date	8/2/79			
	Driller Log Available	YES			
	Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO		0	
	Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO		1	
	Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO		1	
	Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO		2	
	Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO		1	
	Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO		1	
Total System Construction Score				6	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
	Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO		2	
	Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES		1	
	Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO		1	
	Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES		0	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A			IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score Microbial Score
	Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2 2
	Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0
	IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	YES	YES	YES	NO NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A			2	2	2 2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
	Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	5	6	7 2
	(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8 4
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	4	2
	4 Points Maximum		1	4	2
	Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0 0
	Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0 0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B			9	12	10 4
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
	Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1
	Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II			3	3	3 0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
	Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1
	Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III			2	2	2 0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score			16	19	17 6
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score			13	14	13 12
5. Final Well Ranking			High	High	High Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	1/1/69				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO			1	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				6	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	NO			2	
Total Hydrologic Score				6	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	57	49	60	11
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	6	16	9	
4 Points Maximum		4	4	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	0	2	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		12	14	12	8
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		19	21	19	10
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		16	16	16	16
5. Final Well Ranking		High	High	High	High

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	10/26/72				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO		0		
Well meets IDWR construction standards	YES		0		
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO		1		
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES		0		
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO		1		
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO		1		
Total System Construction Score			3		
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO		2		
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES		1		
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO		1		
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES		0		
Total Hydrologic Score			4		
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	25	30	22	5
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	3	2	2	
4 Points Maximum		3	2	2	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	2	0	2	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		13	10	12	8
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		20	17	19	10
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		11	10	11	11
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	1/1/87				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES			0	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				3	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES			0	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				2	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	7	5	7	1
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	2
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	2	1	2	
4 Points Maximum		2	1	2	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		10	9	10	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		17	16	17	4
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		8	8	8	7
5. Final Well Ranking		High	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	2/11/90				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES			0	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				3	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	NO			0	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				3	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	1	1	1	1
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		2	2	2	2
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
4 Points Maximum		1	1	1	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		3	3	3	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		10	10	10	4
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		8	8	8	8
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	12/14/94				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	YES	2001			
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO	1			
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	YES	0			
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO	2			
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES	0			
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	YES	0			
Total System Construction Score		3			
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO	2			
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES	1			
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO	1			
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	NO	2			
Total Hydrologic Score		6			
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	38	37	37	7
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	3	5	4	
4 Points Maximum		3	4	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	2	2	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		13	14	12	8
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		20	21	19	10
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		13	13	13	13
5. Final Well Ranking		High	High	High	High

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	10/17/60				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				5	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	24	33	35	5
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	6	14	7	
4 Points Maximum		4	4	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		12	12	12	8
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		19	19	19	10
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		13	13	13	13
5. Final Well Ranking		High	High	High	High

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	11/3/71				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO			1	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				6	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES			0	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				2	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	20	22	22	2
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	4
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	2	6	2	
4 Points Maximum		2	4	2	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		10	12	10	4
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		17	19	17	6
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		11	12	11	10
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate



1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	6/23/76				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				5	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	2	4	4	1
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		4	8	8	2
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	4	1	1	
4 Points Maximum		4	1	1	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	2	0	2	0
Land use Zone 1B	25 to 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land	2	2	2	2
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		12	11	13	4
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		19	18	20	6
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		13	13	13	11
5. Final Well Ranking		High	High	High	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
	Drill Date	UNKNOWN			
	Driller Log Available	YES			
	Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO		0	
	Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO		1	
	Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO		1	
	Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO		2	
	Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO		1	
	Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO		1	
Total System Construction Score				6	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
	Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO		2	
	Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES		1	
	Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO		1	
	Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	NO		2	
Total Hydrologic Score				6	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A			IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score
	Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2
	Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0
	IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A			2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
	Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	23	36	38
	(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	2	13	3
	4 Points Maximum		2	4	3
	Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0
	Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B			10	12	11
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
	Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1
	Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II			3	3	3
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
	Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1
	Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III			2	2	2
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score			17	19	18
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score			15	16	16
5. Final Well Ranking			High	High	High

1. System Construction		SCORE			
	Drill Date	7/3/76			
	Driller Log Available	YES			
	Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO		0	
	Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO		1	
	Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO		1	
	Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES		0	
	Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO		1	
	Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO		1	
Total System Construction Score				4	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
	Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO		2	
	Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	NO		0	
	Depth to first water > 300 feet	YES		0	
	Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES		0	
Total Hydrologic Score				2	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
	Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2
	Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	
	IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	YES	NO	YES	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
	Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	1	1	1
	(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		2	2	2
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	
	4 Points Maximum		1	1	
	Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0
	Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B			3	3	2
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score			5	5	4
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score			7	7	8
5. Final Well Ranking					
		Moderate	High	Moderate	Moderate

## 1. System Construction

## SCORE

Drill Date	5/20/90	
Driller Log Available	YES	
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO	0
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO	1
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO	1
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO	2
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES	0
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO	1

Total System Construction Score 5

## 2. Hydrologic Sensitivity

Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES	0
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES	1
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO	1
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES	0

Total Hydrologic Score 2

## 3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A

IOC Score VOC Score SOC Score Microbial Score

Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2

## Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B

Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	54	54	52	8
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	6	10	5	
4 Points Maximum		4	4	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	0	2	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		12	14	12	8

## Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II

Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0

## Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III

Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0

Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score 19 21 19 10

## 4. Final Susceptibility Source Score

11 11 11 11

## 5. Final Well Ranking

Moderate Moderate Moderate Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	10/1/76				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO			1	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				6	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	2	2	2	1
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		4	4	4	2
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
4 Points Maximum		1	1	1	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		5	5	5	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		12	12	12	4
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		12	12	12	12
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	UNKNOWN				
Driller Log Available	NO				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO			1	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				6	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	NO			2	
Total Hydrologic Score				6	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	1	1	1	1
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		2	2	2	2
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
4 Points Maximum		1	1	1	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		3	3	3	2
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		5	5	5	4
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		13	13	13	14
5. Final Well Ranking		High	High	High	High

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	11/26/69				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO			1	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				6	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES			0	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	NO			2	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	7	10	12	2
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	4
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	3	3	4	
4 Points Maximum		3	3	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		11	11	12	4
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		18	18	19	6
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		14	14	14	12
5. Final Well Ranking		High	High	High	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	2/11/76				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO			1	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				6	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES			0	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	NO			2	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	7	10	12	3
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	6
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	3	3	4	
4 Points Maximum		3	3	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		11	11	12	6
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		18	18	19	8
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		14	14	14	13
5. Final Well Ranking		High	High	High	High



1. System Construction		SCORE			
	Drill Date	UNKNOWN			
	Driller Log Available	YES			
	Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO		0	
	Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO		1	
	Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO		1	
	Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO		2	
	Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO		1	
	Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO		1	
Total System Construction Score				6	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
	Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO		2	
	Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES		1	
	Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO		1	
	Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	NO		2	
Total Hydrologic Score				6	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
	Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2
	Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	
	IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
	Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	19	19	21
	(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	2	7	2
	4 Points Maximum		2	4	2
	Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0
	Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B			10	12	10
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
	Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1
	Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II			3	3	3
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
	Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1
	Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III			2	2	2
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score			17	19	17
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score			15	16	15
5. Final Well Ranking			High	High	High

1. System Construction		SCORE			
	Drill Date	2/7/90			
	Driller Log Available	YES			
	Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO		0	
	Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO		1	
	Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO		1	
	Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES		0	
	Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES		0	
	Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO		1	
Total System Construction Score				3	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
	Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO		2	
	Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES		1	
	Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO		1	
	Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES		0	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
	Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2
	Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	
	IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
	Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	69	85	78
	(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	4	22	4
	4 Points Maximum		4	4	
	Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	0	2	0
	Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B			12	14	12
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
	Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1
	Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II			3	3	3
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
	Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1
	Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III			2	2	2
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score			19	21	19
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score			11	11	11
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	11/18/77				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				5	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	11	14	14	2
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	4
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	2	4	3	
4 Points Maximum		2	4	3	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		10	12	11	4
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		17	19	18	6
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		12	13	13	11
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	High	High	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	4/14/80				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				5	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	49	71	71	6
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	5	22	6	
4 Points Maximum		4	4	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		12	12	12	8
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		19	19	19	10
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		13	13	13	13
5. Final Well Ranking		High	High	High	High

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	8/16/75				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	YES			0	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES			0	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				2	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	IRRIGATED CROPLAND	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	1	1	1	0
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		2	2	2	0
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	4	1	0	
4 Points Maximum		4	1	0	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	2	0	2	0
Land use Zone 1B Greater Than 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land		4	4	4	4
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		12	7	8	4
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II Less than 25% Agricultural Land		0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		19	14	15	6
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		10	9	9	8
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE				
	Drill Date	UNKNOWN				
	Driller Log Available	YES				
	Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO		0		
	Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO		1		
	Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO		1		
	Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO		2		
	Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO		1		
	Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO		1		
Total System Construction Score			6			
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity						
	Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO		2		
	Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES		1		
	Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO		1		
	Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	NO		2		
Total Hydrologic Score			6			
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A			IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
	Land Use Zone 1A	IRRIGATED CROPLAND	2	2	2	2
	Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
	IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A			2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B						
	Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	3	2	3	1
	(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		6	4	6	2
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	4	1	0	
	4 Points Maximum		4	1	0	
	Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	2	0	2	0
	Land use Zone 1B Greater Than 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land		4	4	4	4
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B			16	9	12	6
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II						
	Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
	Land Use Zone II 25 to 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land		1	1	1	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II			4	4	4	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III						
	Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
	Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III			2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score			24	17	20	8
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score			17	15	16	15
5. Final Well Ranking			High	High	High	High

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	1/18/87				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	1997	0			
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO	1			
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	YES	0			
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES	0			
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO	1			
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	YES	0			
Total System Construction Score		2			
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO	2			
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	NO	0			
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO	1			
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	NO	2			
Total Hydrologic Score		5			
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	NO	0	0	0	0
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		0	0	0	0
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	2	0	0	
4 Points Maximum		2	0	0	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	25 to 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land	2	2	2	2
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		4	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	NO	0	0	0	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	0	0	
Land Use Zone II	Greater Than 50% Non-Irrigated Agricultural	1	1	1	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		2	1	1	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	NO	0	0	0	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	0	0	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		1	0	0	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		9	5	5	4
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		11	10	10	11
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
	Drill Date	3/1/93			
	Driller Log Available	YES			
	Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO		0	
	Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO		1	
	Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO		1	
	Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES		0	
	Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO		1	
	Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO		1	
Total System Construction Score				4	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
	Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO		2	
	Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES		1	
	Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO		1	
	Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES		0	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A			IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score
	Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2
	Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0
	IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A			2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
	Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	1	1	1
	(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		2	2	2
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	3	1	1
	4 Points Maximum		3	1	1
	Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	2	0	2
	Land use Zone 1B 25 to 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land		2	2	2
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B			9	5	7
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
	Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1
	Land Use Zone II Greater Than 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land		2	2	2
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II			5	5	5
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
	Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1
	Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III			2	2	2
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score			18	14	16
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score			12	11	11
5. Final Well Ranking			Moderate	Moderate	Moderate



1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	11/30/91				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES			0	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO			1	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				4	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	115	145	134	18
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	12	34	15	
4 Points Maximum		4	4	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	0	2	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		12	14	12	8
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		19	21	19	10
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		12	12	12	12
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
	Drill Date	UNKNOWN			
	Driller Log Available	NO			
	Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO	0		
	Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO	1		
	Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO	1		
	Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO	2		
	Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO	1		
	Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO	1		
Total System Construction Score			6		
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
	Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO	2		
	Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES	1		
	Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO	1		
	Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	NO	2		
Total Hydrologic Score			6		
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A			IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score
	Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2
	Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0
	IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A			2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
	Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	4	4	3
	(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	6
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1
	4 Points Maximum		1	1	1
	Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	0	0	2
	Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B			9	9	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
	Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1
	Land Use Zone II	25 to 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land	1	1	1
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II			4	4	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
	Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1
	Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III			2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score			17	17	4
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score			15	15	14
5. Final Well Ranking			High	High	High

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	5/11/95				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES			0	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				3	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES			0	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				2	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	IRRIGATED CROPLAND	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	3	2	3	2
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		6	4	6	4
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	6	1	2	
4 Points Maximum		4	1	2	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	0	0	2	0
Land use Zone 1B Greater Than 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land		4	4	4	4
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		14	9	14	8
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II 25 to 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land		1	1	1	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		4	4	4	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		22	17	22	10
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		9	8	9	9
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	7/28/83				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				5	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	NO			0	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				3	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	38	48	47	6
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	5	11	6	
4 Points Maximum		4	4	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	0	2	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		12	14	12	8
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		19	21	19	10
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		12	12	12	12
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	High	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	2/25/91				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	YES	2001			
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO	1			
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	YES	0			
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES	0			
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES	0			
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	YES	0			
Total System Construction Score		1			
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO	2			
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES	1			
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO	1			
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES	0			
Total Hydrologic Score		4			
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	13	9	13	7
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	6	5	3	
4 Points Maximum		4	4	3	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	0	2	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	25 to 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land	2	2	2	2
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		14	16	13	10
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		21	23	20	12
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		9	10	9	9
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	High	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	11/17/72				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				5	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	NO			2	
Total Hydrologic Score				6	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	2	1	2	1
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		4	2	4	2
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	3	0	1	
4 Points Maximum		3	0	1	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	0	0	2	0
Land use Zone 1B	25 to 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land	2	2	2	2
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		9	4	9	4
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Greater Than 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land	2	2	2	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		5	5	5	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		18	13	18	6
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		15	14	15	13
5. Final Well Ranking		High	High	High	High

1. System Construction		SCORE			
	Drill Date	UNKNOWN			
	Driller Log Available	YES			
	Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO		0	
	Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO		1	
	Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO		1	
	Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO		2	
	Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO		1	
	Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO		1	
Total System Construction Score				6	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
	Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO		2	
	Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES		1	
	Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO		1	
	Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES		0	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A			IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score
	Land Use Zone 1A	IRRIGATED CROPLAND	2	2	2
	Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0
	IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A			2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
	Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	2	2	2
	(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		4	4	4
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	4	0	0
	4 Points Maximum		4	0	0
	Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	0	0	2
	Land use Zone 1B Greater Than 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land		4	4	4
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B			12	8	10
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
	Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1
	Land Use Zone II Greater Than 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land		2	2	2
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II			5	5	5
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
	Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1
	Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III			2	2	2
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score			21	17	19
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score			14	13	14
5. Final Well Ranking			High	High	High
					Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	1/27/70				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES			0	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO			1	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				4	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	10	17	17	3
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	6
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	3	7	5	
4 Points Maximum		3	4	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		11	12	12	6
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		18	19	19	8
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		12	12	12	11
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate



1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	1/31/92				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				5	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	41	60	57	3
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	6
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	5	15	7	
4 Points Maximum		4	4	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	0	2	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		12	14	12	6
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		19	21	19	8
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		13	13	13	12
5. Final Well Ranking		High	High	High	Moderate

1. System Construction			SCORE			
	Drill Date	7/3/89				
	Driller Log Available	YES				
	Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO		0		
	Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO		1		
	Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO		1		
	Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO		2		
	Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO		1		
	Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO		1		
Total System Construction Score				6		
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity						
	Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO		2		
	Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	NO		0		
	Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO		1		
	Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES		0		
Total Hydrologic Score				3		
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A			IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
	Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
	Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
	IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A			2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B						
	Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	17	21	24	5
	(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	5	4	4	
	4 Points Maximum		4	4	4	
	Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	2	0	2	0
	Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B			14	12	14	8
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II						
	Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
	Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II			3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III						
	Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
	Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III			2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score			21	19	21	10
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score			13	13	13	13
5. Final Well Ranking			High	High	High	High

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	3/12/92				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES			0	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				3	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	YES			0	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				3	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	5	6	6	1
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	2
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
4 Points Maximum		1	1	1	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	2	2	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		11	11	9	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		18	18	16	4
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		10	10	9	8
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	7/13/58				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				5	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	25	33	33	6
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	5	9	5	
4 Points Maximum		4	4	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	2	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		14	12	12	8
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		21	19	19	10
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		13	13	13	13
5. Final Well Ranking		High	High	High	High

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	7/1/68				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES			0	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				3	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES			0	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				2	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	48	65	61	8
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	7	24	6	
4 Points Maximum		4	4	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	0	2	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		12	14	12	8
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		19	21	19	10
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		9	9	9	9
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	High	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction			SCORE			
	Drill Date	9/6/92				
	Driller Log Available	YES				
	Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO		0		
	Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO		1		
	Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO		1		
	Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES		0		
	Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES		0		
	Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO		1		
Total System Construction Score				3		
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity						
	Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES		0		
	Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES		1		
	Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO		1		
	Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES		0		
Total Hydrologic Score				2		
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A			IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
	Land Use Zone 1A	IRRIGATED CROPLAND	2	2	2	2
	Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
	IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A			2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B						
	Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	1	1	1	1
	(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		2	2	2	2
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	5	1	1	
	4 Points Maximum		4	1	1	
	Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	2	0	0	0
	Land use Zone 1B	Greater Than 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land	4	4	4	4
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B			12	7	7	6
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II						
	Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
	Land Use Zone II	25 to 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land	1	1	1	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II			4	4	4	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III						
	Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
	Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III			2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score			20	15	15	8
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score			9	8	8	8
5. Final Well Ranking			Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	3/15/93				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				5	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES			0	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				2	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	IRRIGATED CROPLAND	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	1	1	1	1
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		2	2	2	2
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	3	1	1	
4 Points Maximum		3	1	1	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	25 to 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land	2	2	2	2
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		7	5	5	4
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		14	12	12	6
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		10	9	9	9
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	7/17/89				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				5	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	NO			0	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	YES			0	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				2	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	RANGELAND, WOODLAND, BASALT	0	0	0	0
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		0	0	0	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	10	11	11	1
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	2
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	3	2	3	
4 Points Maximum		3	2	3	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		11	10	11	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		16	15	16	2
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		10	10	10	8
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate



1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	4/1/56				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO			1	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				6	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	20	30	32	3
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	6
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	4	6	5	
4 Points Maximum		4	4	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		12	12	12	6
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		19	19	19	8
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		14	14	14	13
5. Final Well Ranking		High	High	High	High

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	UNKNOWN				
Driller Log Available	NO				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO	0			
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO	1			
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO	1			
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO	2			
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO	1			
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO	1			
Total System Construction Score		6			
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO	2			
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES	1			
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO	1			
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	NO	2			
Total Hydrologic Score		6			
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	IRRIGATED CROPLAND	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	NO	0	0	0	0
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		0	0	0	0
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	4	0	0	
4 Points Maximum		4	0	0	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	0	0	2	0
Land use Zone 1B Greater Than 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land		4	4	4	4
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		8	4	6	4
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II Less than 25% Agricultural Land		0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		15	11	13	6
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		15	14	15	14
5. Final Well Ranking		High	High	High	High

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	10/31/83				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	1997	0			
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO	1			
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	YES	0			
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO	2			
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO	1			
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	YES	0			
Total System Construction Score		4			
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES	0			
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES	1			
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO	1			
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES	0			
Total Hydrologic Score		2			
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	1	1	1	1
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		2	2	2	2
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	3	1	1	
4 Points Maximum		3	1	1	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	25 to 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land	2	2	2	2
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		7	5	5	4
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	NO	0	0	0	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	0	0	
Land Use Zone II	25 to 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land	1	1	1	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		2	1	1	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	NO	0	0	0	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	NO	0	0	0	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		0	0	0	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		11	8	8	6
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		8	8	8	8
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	4/11/79				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES			0	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				3	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES			0	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	YES			0	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				1	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	NO	0	0	0	0
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		0	0	0	0
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	NO	0	0	0	
4 Points Maximum		0	0	0	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		0	0	0	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	NO	0	0	0	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	NO	0	0	0	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		0	0	0	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		4	4	4	2
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		5	5	5	5
5. Final Well Ranking		Low	Low	Low	Low

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	4/5/89				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO			1	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				6	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES			0	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				2	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	IRRIGATED PASTURE	1	1	1	1
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		1	1	1	1
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	2	2	1	1
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		4	4	2	2
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	3	1	1	
4 Points Maximum		3	1	1	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B Greater Than 50% Non-Irrigated Agricultural		2	2	2	2
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		9	7	5	4
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II Greater Than 50% Non-Irrigated Agricultural		1	1	1	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		4	4	4	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	0	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	0	1	0	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		1	2	0	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		15	14	10	5
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		11	11	10	10
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	High	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	1/20/97				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO			1	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				6	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	1	1	1	1
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		2	2	2	2
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
4 Points Maximum		1	1	1	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	2	0	2	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		5	3	5	2
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		7	5	7	4
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		11	11	11	12
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	High

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	4/25/90				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES			0	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				3	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	22	33	33	4
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	3	10	4	
4 Points Maximum		3	4	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		11	12	12	8
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		18	19	19	10
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		11	11	11	11
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	5/25/95				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				5	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	8	14	13	1
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	2
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	2	7	2	
4 Points Maximum		2	4	2	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	2	0	2	0
Land use Zone 1B 25 to 50% Non-Irrigated Agricultural Land		1	1	1	1
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		13	13	13	3
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II Less than 25% Agricultural Land		0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		20	20	20	5
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		13	13	13	11
5. Final Well Ranking		High	High	High	Moderate



1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	5/15/91				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES			0	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				3	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	NO			0	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				3	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	21	28	29	2
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	4
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	4	9	6	
4 Points Maximum		4	4	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		12	12	12	4
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		19	19	19	6
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		10	10	10	8
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	4/8/95				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO			1	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				6	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	NO			2	
Total Hydrologic Score				6	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	IRRIGATED CROPLAND	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	NO	0	0	0	0
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		0	0	0	0
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	4	0	0	
4 Points Maximum		4	0	0	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	2	2	0	0
Land use Zone 1B Greater Than 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land		4	4	4	4
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		10	6	4	4
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	NO	0	0	0	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	NO	0	0	0	
Land Use Zone II Less than 25% Agricultural Land		0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		0	0	0	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		14	10	8	6
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		15	14	14	14
5. Final Well Ranking		High	High	High	High

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	11/25/92				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES			0	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				3	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	19	23	26	5
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	5	7	4	
4 Points Maximum		4	4	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		12	12	12	8
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		19	19	19	10
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		11	11	11	11
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	12/27/77				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				5	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	NO			0	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				3	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	IRRIGATED CROPLAND	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	0	2	2	0
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		0	4	4	0
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	4	2	2	
4 Points Maximum		4	2	2	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	2	0	2	0
Land use Zone 1B Greater Than 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land		4	4	4	4
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		10	10	12	4
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II Less than 25% Agricultural Land		0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		17	17	19	6
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		11	11	12	10
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
	Drill Date	3/8/98			
	Driller Log Available	YES			
	Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO		0	
	Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO		1	
	Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO		1	
	Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO		2	
	Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO		1	
	Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO		1	
Total System Construction Score				6	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
	Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO		2	
	Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES		1	
	Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO		1	
	Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES		0	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A			IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score Microbial Score
	Land Use Zone 1A	RANGELAND, WOODLAND, BASALT	0	0	0 0
	Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0
	IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A			0	0	0 0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
	Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	NO	0	0	0 0
	(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		0	0	0 0
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	NO	0	0	0 0
	4 Points Maximum		0	0	0 0
	Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0 0
	Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0 0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B			0	0	0 0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
	Contaminant Sources Present	NO	0	0	0 0
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	NO	0	0	0 0
	Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0 0
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II			0	0	0 0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
	Contaminant Source Present	NO	0	0	0 0
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	NO	0	0	0 0
	Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0 0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III			0	0	0 0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score			0	0	0 0
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score			10	10	10 10
5. Final Well Ranking			Moderate	Moderate	Moderate Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	8/17/95				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				5	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	RANGELAND, WOODLAND, BASALT	0	0	0	0
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		0	0	0	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	NO	0	0	0	0
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		0	0	0	0
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	NO	0	0	0	
4 Points Maximum		0	0	0	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		0	0	0	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	NO	0	0	0	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	NO	0	0	0	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		0	0	0	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		2	2	2	0
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		9	9	9	9
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	12/1/93				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				5	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	YES			0	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				3	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	RANGELAND, WOODLAND, BASALT	0	0	0	0
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		0	0	0	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	NO	0	0	0	0
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		0	0	0	0
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	NO	0	0	0	
4 Points Maximum		0	0	0	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		0	0	0	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		5	5	5	0
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		9	9	9	8
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	4/5/94				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	YES			0	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES			0	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO			1	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				3	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES			0	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	IRRIGATED CROPLAND	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	NO	0	0	0	0
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		0	0	0	0
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	4	0	0	
4 Points Maximum		4	0	0	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	0	0	2	0
Land use Zone 1B Greater Than 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land		4	4	4	4
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		8	4	6	4
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II Greater Than 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land		2	2	2	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		5	5	5	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	YES	1	1	1	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		3	3	3	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		18	14	16	6
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		9	8	8	7
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate



1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	3/21/88				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES			0	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO			1	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				4	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES			0	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				2	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	1	1	1	1
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		2	2	2	2
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
4 Points Maximum		1	1	1	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		3	3	3	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	YES	1	1	1	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		3	3	3	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		11	11	11	4
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		8	8	8	8
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	9/1/82				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO			1	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				6	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	NO			2	
Total Hydrologic Score				6	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	61	72	72	9
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	11	17	11	
4 Points Maximum		4	4	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	0	2	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		12	14	12	8
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		19	21	19	10
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		16	16	16	16
5. Final Well Ranking		High	High	High	High

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	2/24/78				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES			0	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				3	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	YES			0	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				3	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	61	72	71	12
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	11	17	11	
4 Points Maximum		4	4	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	0	2	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		12	14	12	8
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		19	21	19	10
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		10	10	10	10
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	High	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	UNKNOWN				
Driller Log Available	NO				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO	0			
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO	1			
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO	1			
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO	2			
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO	1			
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO	1			
Total System Construction Score		6			
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO	2			
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES	1			
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO	1			
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	NO	2			
Total Hydrologic Score		6			
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	6	3	6	2
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	6	8	4
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
4 Points Maximum		1	1	1	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	0	2	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		9	9	9	4
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		16	16	16	6
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		15	15	15	14
5. Final Well Ranking		High	High	High	High

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	UNKNOWN				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO			1	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				6	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	NO			2	
Total Hydrologic Score				6	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	IRRIGATED CROPLAND	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	1	1	1	0
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		2	2	2	0
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	4	0	0	
4 Points Maximum		4	0	0	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	2	0	2	0
Land use Zone 1B Greater Than 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land		4	4	4	4
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		12	6	8	4
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II Less than 25% Agricultural Land		0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		19	13	15	6
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		16	15	15	14
5. Final Well Ranking		High	High	High	High

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	UNKNOWN				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES			0	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO			1	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				4	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES			0	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				2	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	IRRIGATED CROPLAND	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	1	1	1	1
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		2	2	2	2
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	5	1	1	
4 Points Maximum		4	1	1	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	0	0	2	0
Land use Zone 1B Greater Than 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land		4	4	4	4
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		10	7	9	6
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		12	9	11	8
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		8	8	8	9
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	3/25/94				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				5	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	4	4	4	1
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	2
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
4 Points Maximum		1	1	1	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		9	9	9	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		16	16	16	4
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		12	12	12	11
5. Final Well Ranking		High	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	6/30/78				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES			0	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				3	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES			0	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	NO			2	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	37	36	36	7
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	5	5	7	
4 Points Maximum		4	4	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	0	2	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		12	14	12	8
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		19	21	19	10
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		11	11	11	11
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	High	Moderate	Moderate



1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	3/15/89				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	YES	2001			
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO	1			
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	YES	0			
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES	0			
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES	0			
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO	1			
Total System Construction Score		2			
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES	0			
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES	1			
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO	1			
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	NO	2			
Total Hydrologic Score		4			
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	35	36	37	3
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	6
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	3	7	3	
4 Points Maximum		3	4	3	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	0	2	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		11	14	11	6
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		18	21	18	8
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		10	10	10	9
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	High	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	5/19/97				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	YES	2000			
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO	1			
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	YES	0			
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES	0			
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES	0			
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO	1			
Total System Construction Score		2			
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES	0			
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES	1			
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO	1			
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES	0			
Total Hydrologic Score		2			
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	5	3	4	2
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	6	8	4
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	2	1	2	
4 Points Maximum		2	1	2	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	0	2	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		10	9	10	4
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		17	16	17	6
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		7	7	7	6
5. Final Well Ranking		High	High	High	High

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	6/23/93				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES			0	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO			1	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				4	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	YES			0	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				3	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	33	338	36	5
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	5	6	6	
4 Points Maximum		4	4	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		12	12	12	8
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		19	19	19	10
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		11	11	11	11
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	5/10/93				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES			0	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO			1	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				4	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	YES			0	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				3	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	33	33	36	5
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	5	6	6	
4 Points Maximum		4	4	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		12	12	12	8
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		19	19	19	10
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		11	11	11	11
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	7/22/96				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES			0	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				3	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	YES			0	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				3	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	RANGELAND, WOODLAND, BASALT	0	0	0	0
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		0	0	0	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	1	1	1	0
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		2	2	2	0
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
4 Points Maximum		1	1	1	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		8	8	8	0
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		8	8	8	6
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	5/31/72				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES			0	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				3	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	NO	0	0	0	0
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		0	0	0	0
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	NO	0	0	0	
4 Points Maximum		0	0	0	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		0	0	0	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	NO	0	0	0	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	NO	0	0	0	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		0	0	0	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		4	4	4	2
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		8	8	8	8
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	High	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	7/13/96				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES			0	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				3	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES			0	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				1	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	47	638	16	5
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	5	17	6	
4 Points Maximum		4	4	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	0	2	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		12	14	12	8
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		19	21	19	10
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		9	9	9	9
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	2/11/76				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				5	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	5	6	6	0
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	0
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	0	1	1	
4 Points Maximum		0	1	1	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	2	0	2	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		10	9	11	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Greater Than 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land	2	2	2	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		5	5	5	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		19	18	20	2
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		13	13	13	10
5. Final Well Ranking		High	High	High	Moderate



1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	6/9/89				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	YES			0	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES			0	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				3	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	NO			0	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				3	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	14	16	15	3
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	6
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	4	4	5	
4 Points Maximum		4	4	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		12	12	12	6
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		19	19	19	8
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		10	10	10	9
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

1. System Construction	SCORE			
Drill Date	UNKNOWN			
Driller Log Available	NO			
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO	0		
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO	1		
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO	1		
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO	2		
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO	1		
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO	1		
Total System Construction Score		6		
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity				
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES	0		
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES	1		
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO	1		
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	NO	2		
Total Hydrologic Score		4		
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B				
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	5	5	4
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	4
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	2	3	2
4 Points Maximum		2	3	2
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		10	11	10
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II				
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III				
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	YES	1	1	1
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		3	3	3
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		18	19	18
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		14	14	14
5. Final Well Ranking		High	High	High
				Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
	Drill Date	UNKNOWN			
	Driller Log Available	NO			
	Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO	0		
	Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO	1		
	Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO	1		
	Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO	2		
	Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO	1		
	Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO	1		
Total System Construction Score			6		
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
	Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES	0		
	Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES	1		
	Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO	1		
	Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	NO	2		
Total Hydrologic Score			4		
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A			IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score
	Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2
	Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0
	IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A			2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
	Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	5	5	4
	(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	4
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	2	3	2
	4 Points Maximum		2	3	2
	Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0
	Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B			10	11	10
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
	Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1
	Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II			3	3	3
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
	Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1
	Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	YES	1	1	1
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III			3	3	3
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score			18	19	18
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score			14	14	14
5. Final Well Ranking			High	High	High
					Moderate

1. System Construction			SCORE			
	Drill Date	UNKNOWN				
	Driller Log Available	NO				
	Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO	0			
	Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO	1			
	Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO	1			
	Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO	2			
	Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO	1			
	Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO	1			
Total System Construction Score			6			
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity						
	Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES	0			
	Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES	1			
	Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO	1			
	Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	NO	2			
Total Hydrologic Score			4			
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A			IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
	Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
	Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
	IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A			2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B						
	Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	5	5	4	2
	(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	4
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	2	3	2	
	4 Points Maximum		2	3	2	
	Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
	Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B			10	11	10	4
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II						
	Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
	Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II			3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III						
	Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
	Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III			2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score			17	18	17	6
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score			13	14	13	12
5. Final Well Ranking			High	High	High	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	UNKNOWN				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO			1	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				6	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	NO			2	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES			0	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	7	10	8	0
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	0
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	2	0	
4 Points Maximum		1	2	0	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	0	2	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		9	12	8	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		16	19	15	2
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		13	14	13	11
5. Final Well Ranking		High	High	High	Moderate

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	1/3/62				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO			1	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				6	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES			0	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	NO			2	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	10	14	12	4
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	3	5	2	
4 Points Maximum		3	4	2	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	0	2	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		11	14	10	8
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		18	21	17	10
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		14	14	13	14
5. Final Well Ranking		High	High	High	High

1. System Construction		SCORE			
	Drill Date	UNKNOWN			
	Driller Log Available	YES			
	Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO		0	
	Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO		1	
	Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO		1	
	Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO		2	
	Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO		1	
	Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO		1	
Total System Construction Score				6	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
	Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES		0	
	Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES		1	
	Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO		1	
	Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	NO		2	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A			IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score
	Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2
	Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0
	IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A			2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
	Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	10	14	12
	(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	3	5	2
	4 Points Maximum		3	4	2
	Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	0	2	0
	Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B			11	14	10
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
	Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1
	Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II			3	3	3
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
	Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1
	Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1
	Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III			2	2	2
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score			18	21	17
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score			14	14	13
5. Final Well Ranking			High	High	High

1. System Construction		SCORE			
Drill Date	2/8/75				
Driller Log Available	YES				
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	NO			0	
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO			1	
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO			1	
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO			2	
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO			1	
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO			1	
Total System Construction Score				6	
2. Hydrologic Sensitivity					
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES			0	
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES			1	
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO			1	
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	NO			2	
Total Hydrologic Score				4	
3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	URBAN/COMMERCIAL	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	NO	0	0	0	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		2	2	2	2
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	10	14	12	4
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	3	5	2	
4 Points Maximum		3	4	2	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	0	2	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Less Than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	0
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		11	14	10	8
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		3	3	3	0
Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III					
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		18	21	17	10
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		14	14	13	14
5. Final Well Ranking		High	High	High	High